SAINT AVSTINS RELIGION:

VVHEREIN IS MANIfestly proued out of the Workes of that *Learned Father*, who liued neere twelue hundred yeares before the time of LVTHER; that he dissented from *Poperie*, and agreed with the *Religion* of the PROTESTANTS, in all the maine Poynts of *Faith* and DOCTRINE:

Contrary to that Impudent, Erronious, and Slanderous Position of the bragging PAPISTS of our Times, who falsly affirme, Wee had no *Religion*, before the *Times of* LVTHER *and* CALVINE.

Wherevnto is newly added, *Saint* AVSTINS SVMMES; *in Answer to Mr.* IOHN BRERELY, *Priest.*

LONDON.
Printed for *Iohn Marriott*, and are to be sold at his Shop in S^t. *Dunstane's* Churchyard. in *Fleet-street*. 1625.

TO ALL SEDVCED Papiſts, that now are, or hereafter ſhall bee.

SVch is the groſſe ignorance of moſt Papiſts in theſe times, that they neither know what they doe, or ſhould beleeue: much like the [a] Collier, that told the Diuell hee did beleeue as the Romane Church did: being asked againe, what that faith was; anſwered, the ſame faith that hee beleeued in. Surely the [b] Diuels gaue better teſtimony of their faith and knowledge, and the [c] Apoſtle witneſſeth it; and yet the [d] Popiſh Prelates will haue their People learne no Creed but this, which is, to beleeue they [e] know not what.

No maruell then, that the Romiſh Impoſtors haue taken away the [f] key of knowledge; nay, they iudge it a [g] meere inuention of the Diuell, that Lay-men ſhould reade the Scripture; and they ſay, that [h] ſome Plough-men for reading of it were iuſtly poſſeſſed of the Diuell, and therfore ignorance of the Word is beſt. And as [i] *Hoſius* ſaith, To know nothing, is to know all things: and in ſtead of Bibles, they haue inuented Images and Crucifixes (wherewith too ma-

a *Hoſt. in Prol. Bren. l. 3. p. 146. Tig. Hierar. h. 1. ca. 5. par. 38. Iac. de graf. deciſ. p. li. 1. ca. 26. n. 34. Anton. p. 1. T. 5. ca. 2. Apol. tranſ. by Stapel.*

b Math. 4. 6, 8, 29.

c Act. 19. 15.

c Iam. 2. 19.

d *Fides implicita eſt, credere ſecundum quod Eccleſia credit, vnde non omnis Chriſtianus tenetur, illos articul. fidei ſcire explicitè, ſed tantùm Clerici. Ia. de graf. Eccl. li. 2. ca 8. n. 16.*

e *Fides per ignorantiam melius definitur, quam per notitiam. Bel. de Iuſtif. li. 1. cap. 7.*

f Luk. 11. 52.

g *Mart. Pereſ. de trad. pag. 44.*

h *Thyr. de Dimoniac. cap. 21.*

i *Conf. Petric. cap. 14. pag. 18.*

ny Dames (in theſe dayes) adorne their ſhameleſſe Breſts) and Maſſebookes commonly imprinted, with a mixture of red Letters, to ſignifie the dye of *Romes* Religion: but as for the Scriptures, they are farre more dangerous then the ribaldry of *Terence*, the villany of *Machianell*, or the fabulous lyes of their *Legends*, [l] being the maine and principall cauſe of all Hereſies, and the very beholding of them is enough to infect ſilly Catholickes; therfore [m] much leſſe may they read them; and if any be permitted to ſtudy the Scripture, it muſt be ſuch a part thereof as hath beene hallowed with their Expurgatory gloſſe, and thoſe perſons muſt bee ſuch, which the Confeſſor knowes to be ſtiffe and obſtinate Papiſts, vpon whom that iudgement is already fallen, [n] *They ſhall heare with their eares, but ſhall not vnderſtand; they ſhall ſee with their eyes, but not perceiue*: And all this is not ſufficient, but they muſt haue the permiſsion of the Inquiſitor, and the Pariſh Prieſt too. This is the [o] Canon of the Conuenticle of *Trent*, commended by the [p] *Rhemiſts*, and ſeconded by [q] *Molanus*, *Bellarmine*, *Hoſius*, *Sanders*, and others.

And now you poore ſeduced ſoules, why do your holy Fathers conſtraine you to beleeue ye know not what? and reſtraine you from the knowledge of Scripture, (whence your faith if it be ſound, muſt bee truly collected) and the ignorance whereof is the root of all [r] error, and the cauſe of vnbeliefe? is it not becauſe they would haue your ſoules to depend on their lips, (vnder whoſe tongue is the poyſon of Aſps?) is it not becauſe they would carry their helliſh Poſitions and practices, as in a cloud, out of your ſight? Is it not becauſe they know that the ſplendor of

l *Franc. Uuan. Mogol. bren. in 4. Sent. d. 13.*
m *Index l. proh. reg. 4. Linw. in conſtit. prou. l. 5.*
n *Eſa. 7. 9.*
o *Con. Trid. ſe. 4.*
p *Eccleſia opt. nouit quomodo vbi, quando, & quibus, hæc Dom. munera impartiend. ſint ergo nec ſimpliciter permittit quid nocet indignis, nec ſimpliciter prohibet, quod dignis multum prodeſſet in præf. tranſ.*
q *Negamus tamen ab vlis laic. requiri ſtudium Script. imò ſaluberiter dicimus eos à Script. lectione arceri, ſufficereq; vt ex præſcript: paſtorum & Doct. Eccle. vitæ curſum moderent. Ioh. Mol. Loua. de pract. Theol. tract. 3. c. 27. Bel. li. 2. ca. 15. Hoſ. con. præfationem Monhem. San. viſ. Monarch. l. 7.*
r *Math. 22. 29.*

of Gods Word will ſoone diſperſe that Egyptian darkneſſe they keepe you in? Is it not becauſe (like Sathan) they would [f] take you at their pleaſure? [f] 2 Tim. 2. 26.

But yet ſuch is the impudencie of your falſe prophets, that, notwithſtanding they will tell you, that they teach nothing without the eſpeciall warrant of Scripture, and that all the Fathers were Papiſts, and held their opinions: both which are their owne fictions and falſe. For the firſt, they will neither abide the tryall of our faith by the Word of God, (which was the reaſon that [t] *Fiſher* in his laſt Conference neither could nor would deny, that the Proteſtants profeſſed the ſame faith which Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught) nor yet of their owne Religion; and the reaſon is, becauſe it wholly depends vpon the Traditions of the new Romiſh Church, which is confirmed by [u] *Gregory* the thirteenth, where hee ſaith, *Let men receiue with more reuerence what the Pope teacheth, then the Scriptures.* And [x] *Canus* confeſſeth, that moſt points of the Romane faith, are not contained in the Scripture: And [y] *Andradius* ſpeakes plainly, that many poynts of their Faith muſt needs reele and totter, if they were not ſupported by the helpe of Tradition; and this is the cauſe your Maſſe-Prieſts will not endure that the Reſolution of the now depending Controuerſies betweene vs and them, ſhould be by the authority of the Scriptures, but run from them to the Fathers, from them to the Church, from thence to the Pope, from him to Councels, and from theſe to their owne iudgements.

[t] See the Fiſher caught in his owne net.

[u] *Can. Greg. d. 40. in an. Marg.*

[x] *Canus loc. l. 3. cap. 3. pag. 151.*

[y] *Andrad. Orthod. expl. li. 2.*

Now for the ſecond, If the Fathers were Papiſts,

as they ſay, why do their chiefe Doctors condemne and contemne them? [z] *Bellarmine* ſaith, That Saint *Origen* was burnt in Hell with *Arrius* and *Neſtorius*; and that [a] *Tertullian* was a *Montaniſt*. [b] *Alphonſus*, that he will beleeue *Anacletus* better then Saint *Ierome*, or Saint *Auguſtine*. [c] *Tolet* the Ieſuite ſaith, That he wil beleeue neither *Auguſtine*, nor *Ambroſe*, nor *Chryſoſtome*, nor *Theodoret*, nor *Photius*: the like eſteeme they haue of *Cyprian*, *Gregory*, *Beda*, and the reſt, if in any poynt they make againſt them and their Doctrine.

z *Bellar. Purg. lib. 2. cap. 8.*

a *Bellar. Rom. pont. li. 4. cap. 8.*

b *Alphonſ. adu. Hæreſ.*

c *Tolet. Rom. 9. pag. 421.*

And no maruell; for the [d] Doctors of *Paris* profeſſe boldly, that they will not beleeue either *Gratian*, or *Aquinas*, or *Lumbard*, or *Anſelme*, or *Hugo*, becauſe they were erronious. [e] *Bellarmine* againe condemneth *Scotus*, *Durand*, *Gabriel*, *Ariminenſis*, *Capreolus* and *Marſilius* in the poynt of Free-will: and yet all theſe were Popiſh Writers, famous and moſt eminent in their times.

d *Error Artic. Pariſ. c. 39. 140.*

e *Bell. de grat. & lib. arb. lib. 5. cap. 4.*

Nay, which is more worthy obſeruation, though they teach that the Scriptures and Fathers muſt haue their authority from the Pope, and that wee [f] ought to ſtand rather to his iudgement then the iudgement of the whole world; [g] and that when Queſtions cannot be fitly decided by the Doctors, then it is free for him to interpoſe his authority, [h] that he is aboue Church and Councels, [i] and that hee may make that to bee the meaning of things, which indeed is not (as they affirme:) yet notwithſtanding they will not ſubmit themſelues in opinion and iudgement to the Pope: and therefore the *Venetians* boldly publiſhed Concluſions againſt *Paulus Quintus*, and his Supremacie: [k] *Catharinus* holds it vnmeet, that wiſe men ſhould

f *Alua. Pelag. Planct. li. 1. art. 6.*

g *Greg. à Val. tom. 3. pag. 239.*

h *Turrecr. ſum. lib. 3. ca. 44. Bel. de concil. lib. 2. cap. 17.*

i *Quanto de tranſl. Epiſc. in Gloſſa.*

k *Cath. de cert. grat. aſſent. 13.*

ſhould binde themſelues to the iudgement of the Pope, ſeeing hee is not alwayes aſſiſted by the Spirit of God. [l] *Almaine* ſaith, That it is not neceſſary to beleeue what the Pope determineth. [m] *Bellarmine* and *Caietan* hold it lawfull to reſiſt him; [n] *Franciſcus Victoria*, that it were good a Councell would bridle him; and [o] *Bozius* ſaith, he may bee an Heretike, and both teach and write Hereſies; and [p] many learned Papiſts haue written againſt his Decrees in Councels.

l *Alm. in Veſp. pag. 133. poſt Moral. in 8.*
m *Bel. de Rom. pont. li. 2. cap. 29.*
n *arg. 7. Caiet. de author. Pap. & Conc. cap. 27.*
Vict. relect. 4. de poteſt. Pap. & Conc.
o *Boz. de ſign. Eccleſ. tom. 2. lib. 18. cap. 6.*
p *Driedo de ſcript. & dogm. Eccl. lib. 1. ca. vlt. Sigon. comment. in ſeu. ſulp. Sixtus Senenſ. Bib. lib. 1. pag 41.*

Theſe things being apparant and true (if wee may beleeue your owne Writers, here onely cited) what good acceptance can this Booke expect from you, although it doe truely ſet forth vnto you the minde and iudgement of an holy and learned Father, diſagreeing from your opinions in ſixty two ſeuerall poynts? If your Teachers will be tryed neither by Scriptures, nor Fathers, nor Pope, Saint *Auguſtine* will hardly preuaile: yet becauſe they boaſt to you, that all the Fathers were Papiſts, and eſpecially St. *Auguſtine*, yee ſhall doe well for your better ſatisfaction, and the tryall of their ſpirits, to read this enſuing Treatiſe, moſt faithfully & painfully collected from his Writings, and for your eaſe digeſted into a few ſheetes of paper.

To conclude, ſearch the Scriptures, ſtudy the Fathers, and read the Antiquaries, and ſee if in them ye can finde *Rabbies* comparable to your Clerkes, or whether any Chriſtian or Pagan euer taught or did as they, whether any of their Prieſts like them did ſeeke to ſtrange the vitall ſpirits of humane ſociety, teaching [q] neighbors to rob one another of their goods, [r] debtors not to pay what they haue promiſed, [s] ſeruants to yeeld no ſubiection and fidelity to their

q *Hæreticis licitum eſt auferri, quæ habent Dec. Pap. apud Grat. cauſ. 15.*
r *Simancha Epiſt. Sen. inſtit. Catbol. tit. 6.*
s *Simancha ubi ſupra.*

their masters, [t] wiues no obedience to their Husbands, [u] fathers no loue to their children, [x] children no honor to their parents, [y] and you Catholickes not to preserue, but seeke the blood and life of your parents, brethren, kindred and Countrey-men.

Did ye euer heare or read of any Church-men, that haue imployed Poynadoes, Poyson, or Salt-peter, as they haue done? or can you find, or they proue that euer any Protestant Bishop, like Pope *Sixtus* the 4. with his Legat, did murder 2.[z] Princes in the Church at Masse? (much like to [a] *Pilat*, that mingled the blood of the Galileans with their Sacrifice) did euer any of our Priests mixe poyson with the powder of Adamant, in a Cōmunion Cup, with the precious blood of Christ, to poyson an Emperor, as [b] *Bernard* a Fryer did, when therwith he destroyed *Henry* the 7. at *Bonconuent?* Were there euer such Artizans & Engins of villany of our Religion, that with a poysoned knife did stab a King, as *Clement* a Fryer did *Henry* the 3. of *France*, or with a spark of fire would haue blowne vp the whole body of a Kingdome, as *Garnet* the Arch-Priest with his fellowes attempted not long since? And yet these are your holy Fathers and Confessors whom you follow & adore: take heed therfore what you learne of these, let them not alienate your soules from God, and your hearts from your Countrey, and assure your selues, that so long as ye follow them, yee shall neither get sound comfort, nor a good conscience. [c] Oh that ye were wise, then would ye vnderstand this, ye would consider your latter end.

t *Idem quo supra.*
u *Alan. Card.*
x *Nam propter haeresin patris, fil. est sui iuris. Simanc. Alanus, Parsonus.*
y *Haeretici, nec filij, nec consanguinei dicuntur, sed iuxta legem, sit manus tua super eos, vt fundas sanguinem ipsorum: ex Decr. Greg. 9 caus. 23.*
z *Volateran* saith, they were Princes of Medices.
a Luk. 13. 1.
b *Rom. Concl.*
c Deut. 32. 29.

SAINT

Saint
AVGVSTINES
RELIGION:

Wherein is proued, that hee dissented from Popery, and agreed with the Religion of the Protestants in all the maine *Points of Faith and Doctrine.*

IT is hotly Controuerted betweene vs and the Papists at this day, Whether the Ancient Fathers, and especially St. *Austin*, was of their Religion, or of ours? The Papists challenge all the anc ent Fathers as theirs: and especially Saint *Austin*. Of him they bragge aboue measure. *He* ([b] they say.) *was a Monke, a Professor, a stout Defender, and a strong Maintainer of their Popery: vndoubtedly no Protestant. The particulars of his doctrine* ([c] they say) *touching the seuerall points this day in Controuersie, were consonant and agreeable with their now professed Popery.* All the Heresies of this Age, *Vnius Augustins verbis confutari & proteri vel maximè possunt*: may be confuted & confounded by proofes fetched onely from Saint *Austins* writings, [d] say the Papists. Whereof, to make some shew to the world, as *Torrensis* a Iesuite, in the yeere 1569. published in Latine, a Collection out of Saint *Austines* Workes, of

[a] *Campian. rat. 5.*

[b] The Masse-pr. Petition to his Maiestie, *Anno* 1604. *Sect.* 26.

[c] *Austins Religion, cap. 1. pag.* 11.

[d] *Torrensis Ep. Dedicat. præfix. August. confess.*

all ſuch ſpeeches as he thought made in any ſort for them, and againſt vs; intituling that his Collection, by the name of *Confeſſio Auguſtiniana*: So, about two yeeres ſince, one *Breereley*, a Prieſt (whether Secular, or Ieſuite, I know not) hath publiſhed in *Engliſh* ſuch another collection, out of the ſame Saint *Auguſtines* Workes, intituling it, *Saint Auſtins Religion*. Now for the diſcouery of this their inſolent bragging of Saint *Auguſtine*, I haue thought good, to vndertake the prouing of this Aſſertion. *Viz. That Saint* Auguſtine *Was rather of our Religion then of the Papiſts*: foraſmuch as in the moſt materiall points he is vndoubtedly for vs, and againſt them.

Anno. 1620.

That Saint Auſtin, *in the moſt materiall points of Doctrine is for vs, and againſt the Papiſts, the inſuing inſtances proue manifeſtly.*

1 FIrſt, it is queſtioned between vs and the Papiſts, *How farre forth Fathers are to be followed?* And [a] ſome of them ſay, *Scripta Sanctorum ſunt ad vnguem obſeruanda*. The writings of the Fathers are to bee obſerued to a nayles breadth; [b] Others, *Hodie iubentur omnia teneri vſque ad vltimum iota*. At this day we are bound to beleeue euery thing they ſay. But [c] we ſay, They are ſo farre forth to be beleeued, as they agree with holy Scripture, and no further. Againſt which Aſſertion of ours, they take great exception. For, *This is to giue no more credit to their authority, then to Iewes, Turkes, and Hereticks, and ſo it is quite to reiect their authorities*, ſaith [d] *Kelliſon*. Yet Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion herein. Saint *Auſtin* thought not good to follow the Fathers any further, neither did hee require that any ſhould follow him any further. He, as we, tooke liberty, and gaue liberty to iudge of the Fathers writings, according to their agreement or diſagreement with holy Scriptures.

[a] Author Gloſſ. Marg. in Gra. d. 9. Noli meis, Impreſſ. An. 1516.
[b] Author alterius Gloſſ. ibid.
[c] Harmon Confeſſ. Sect. 1. de ſacra Scriptura.
[d] In his anſwer to Sutcliffes reply to the Surucy, chap. 4. Sect. 6. pag. 66.

That he tooke liberty to himſelfe to iudge ſo, it appeares by this: That when hee was preſſed by *Creſconius* the Grammarian, with a Teſtimony taken out of an Epi-

Ale

stle of Saint *Cyprians*, [e] he answered thus. *Ego illas Epistolas authoritate non teneor, quia literas Cypriani non vt Canonicas habeo, sed eas ex Canonicis considero, & quod in ijs diuinarum Scripturarum authoritate congruit, cum laude eius accipio: quod autem non congruit, cum pace eius respuo*: I am not bound to stand to be tryed by that Epistle, because I doe not account of *Cyprians* Epistles as of Canonicall Scriptures, but examine them by the Canonicall Scriptures: and what I finde in them agreeable to the holy Scriptures, I receiue it with his commendation: what I finde to disagree frō holy Scriptures, with his good leaue, I leaue it. For hereby we are taught (as [f] *Erasmus* noted in the Margent ouer against these words) *Quomodo tam S. Cypriani dicta, quàm aliorum Doctorum accipienda sunt*: How farre foorth we are to esteeme of the speeches of Saint *Cyprian*, and other of the Doctors.

[e] Lib. 2. cont. Crescon. Gram. cap. 32.

[f] In edit. Lugduns. an. 1570.

Againe, the same appeares by this, that in the Controuersie betweene him and Saint *Ierom*, Whether S. *Paul*, *Galat.* 2. 14. reproued Saint *Peter* colourably, or in good earnest: where [g] *Ierom* alleadged seuen Fathers against his Assertion: *viz.* *Origen*, *Didymus*, *Apollinarus*, *Alexander*, *Eusebius*, *Emisenus*, *Theodorus*, and *Chrysostome*; of which Fathers, *Ierom* made so great account, that he desired *Austin* to suffer him to erre with them, if he thought him to erre. *Austin* would not yeeld to *Ierom*, though he could but name two Fathers who were of his minde, but appeales to Saint *Paul* himselfe from all Saint *Ierom*s Fathers; saying: [h] *Pro his omnibus imò supra hos omnes Apostolus Paulus occurrit: ad ipsum confugio, ad ipsum ab omnibus quì aliud sentiunt literarum eius tractatoribus interpello*, &c. I haue *Paul* the Apostle himselfe instead of these all, and aboue these all. To him I flye: To him I appeale from all the Doctors (his Interpreters) which are of other mindes, for this shewes hee would not follow the Fathers further then he thought they agreed with the holy Scriptures.

[g] Epist. 11. inter Epist. August.

[h] Epistola 19.

That he gaue liberty to others to iudge so, it is plaine by these words: [i] *Noli meis literis quasi Canonicis Scripturis inseruire*:

[i] Prom. lib 3. de Trinitate.

inſeruire: ſed in illis & quæ non credebas, cùm inueneris illa cunctanter crede: in iſtis autem quod certum non habebas, niſi certum intellexeris, noli firmum tenere: Giue not like credit to my Writings as to the Canonicall Scriptures. If thou findeſt any thing in the Canonicall Scriptures, which thou beleeuedſt not before, beleeue it preſently vpon thy finding of it: but if thou findeſt any thing in any writings whereof thou waſt not perſwaded before, vnleſſe thou perceiue it to be a certaine truth, doe not beleeue it for truth. And by theſe, [k] *Negare non poſſum, nec debeo, ſicut in ipſis maioribus: ita multa eſſe in tam multis Opuſculis meis, quæ poſſunt iuſto iudicio, & nulla temeritate culpari.* I cannot deny but there are many things in my Workes, as there are in the Writings of the Ancients, which iuſtly and with good diſcretion may be excepted againſt. For ſo much in effect is confeſſed by the [l] Glozer on the Canon Law, and by [m] Cardinall *Turrecremate*. For vpon mention of theſe & ſuch like places as theſe are, *Loquitur Auguſtinus ſecundùm illa tempora, cùm adhuc ſcripta Auguſtini & aliorum Patrum non erant authentica*: Saint *Auſtin* ſpake (ſay they) agreeably to thoſe times, wherein his, and other holy Fathers Writings were not Authenticall. For ſuch words argue, that in their opinion, Saint *Auſtins*, and other holy Fathers writings, were not in Saint *Auſtins* time, in ſo great requeſt, as now with Papiſts. They were no further to bee beleeued then, then men ſaw good proofe, good reaſon. Such is acknowledged in plainer terms by [n] *Indochus Clychtoueus*. For *Liberè eſt cuiq; à Sanctorũ qui poſt tempora Apoſtolorum ſcripſerunt placitis, verum inueſtigando, diſceptandòque declinare, Vbi maiorem habet authoritatem, potiorèmue rationem ad alteram partem impellentem, quemadmodum ſacer Auguſtinus de ſuis ſcriptis cenſet eſſe faciendum*: It is lawfull for euery man who ſeekes to boult out the Truth by way of diſputation, tõ differ in opinion from ſuch holy men as liued ſince the Apoſtles dayes: prouided they haue greater authoritie, and better reaſon to induce them to the contrarie.

k *Lib. 4. de Anima & eius origine, ad Vincent. Victor. Cap. 1.*

l *Diſt. 9. c. Nolimus.*

m *Summ. de Eccl. lib. 4. part 2. cap. 9.*

n *Deceptationes de Magdalena defenſio aduerſ. Marcum Grandualem. Sect 35. fol. 45, 46.*

2 It is queſtioned betweene vs and Papiſts, Whether

When

When there is difference in Bibles about the reading of the Text, the Originals should rather be beleeued then the Translation, that is, *Whether the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and the Greeke of the New Testament should be preferred before the vulgar Latine.* The o Papists in our dayes teach, that now, *Non est quòd ad Hebraica vel Græca recurramus exemplaria*: there is no reason why we should haue recourse to the Hebrew or to the Greeke. Now the vulgar Latine is so Authenticall, p *Ut nemo illa reijcere quouis prætextu audeat*: No man may be so bold vnder any pretence or colour to reiect it. Now q *Græci & Hebraici Codices, sicubi à vulgata editione dissideant; per vulgatam corrigendi & emendandi sunt*: If the Hebrew or the Greeke Bookes differ from the vulgar Latine, they are to bee corrected and amended by the vulgar Latine, saith *Gregory de Valentia*: But we teach the contrary. And that Saint *Austin* is of our opinion herein, it is plaine by his owne words: for, r *Ei linguæ potius credatur, vnde est in aliam, per Interpretes facta Translatio*: When there is difference in Bookes, and both cannot be true; beleeue thou rather, saith Saint *Austin*, what is written in the Booke translated, than in the Translation. And s *Latinæ Linguæ homines duabus alijs ad diuinarum Scripturarum cognitionem habent opus, Hebraica scilicet & Græca, vt ad exemplaria præcedentia recurratur, si quam dubitationem attulerit Latinorum Interpretum infinita varietas*: Those men who vnderstand Latine, stand in need of two other Languages for the better vnderstanding of holy Scripture, to wit, Hebrew and Greeke, to the end that when any doubt ariseth by reason of the multiplicity of Latine Translations, they may haue recourse to the Originals, saith the same *Austin*. And so much is confessed by *Azorius* the Iesuite, and by *Ludouicus Viues*: for, *Olim, cum multa esset Latinorum codicum varietas, patres dicebant, ad Hebraicos vel Græcos Codices recurrendum esse, Sic Hieronymus, sic Augustinus*: In former dayes, when there was great variety of Latine Copies, the Fathers, such as *Ierom* and *Austin*, held opinion, that wee might haue recourse to the Hebrew or Greeke Copies, saith t *Azorius*.

o *Azorius Instit. Moral. part. 3. lib. 8. cap. 3. 2. quæritur.*

p *Conc. Trid. sess. 4. decret. de Edit. & vsu sac. lib.*

q *Analysis fidei lib. 3. cap. 5. pag. 75.*

r *Lib. 15. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 13.*

s *Lib. 2. de doct. Christ. cap. 11.*

t *Loco supra cit.*

And *Hoc ipsum Hieronymus clamat, hoc ipsa docet ratio, & nullus est saniore iudicio qui repugnat*: The same truth is taught by *Ierome*, and euen reason it selfe confirmes the same: neither doth any man of sound iudgement thinke otherwise, saith [u] *Vines* in his Annotations vpon the former place.

Annot. in Aug. de Ciuitat. Dei. l. 15. cap 13.

3 The Papists teach, *That the Apostles had no Commandement from God to write that which they writ, falsum est Deum mandasse Apostolis vt scriberent.* It is not true that God commanded the Apostles to write any thing, saith [x] *Bell. Nemini obscurum est, Christum nihil ipsum scripsisse, sed neque scribendum quicquam Apostolis præcepisse.* It is not vnknowne to any man that Christ himselfe writ nothing; neither is it vnknowne to any man, that hee neuer commanded his Disciples to write any thing, saith Cardinall [y] *Hosius*. Yet we teach contrary. And so doth Saint *Austin*: for, *Quicquid Ille (viz. Christus) de suis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis, tanquam suis manibus imperauit*: Whatsoeuer it pleased Christ that wee should reade concerning his Words or Workes, that hee commanded his Apostles to write as it were with his owne fingers, saith [z] Saint *Austin*.

x *Lib. 4. de Verbo Dei. cap. 3.*

y *Confess. Petricouiæ. cap. 15. de fide & symbolo.*

z *De Consens. Euangelist. lib. 1. cap vlt.*

4 The [a] Papists generally teach, *That all things necessary to salnation, are not contained in Scripture.* And we teach the contrary. The [b] Papists generally teach, *That the Scriptures are full of obscurity*: And [c] one of the greatest Rufflers among them at this day, is not ashamed to say, *Scripturam totam, etiam vbi clarissima videtur, ita esse difficilem & obscuram, vt Interprete certo egeat, qui nobis veram eius sententiam aperiat*: The whole Scripture, euen where it seemes most plaine, is yet so hard and obscure, that it stands in need of a speciall Expositor, who may open vnto vs the meaning of it. But we say, though some places of Scripture be wonderfull obscure, and stand in need of Interpreters, yet such matters as concerne Saluation, are so plainely set downe, that they may easily be learned without any such set and speciall Expositor as Papists dreame of. Now that Saint *Austine* is of our opinion in both these questions, it is

a *N. S.* in his Antidote against English Sectaries. *cont. 2. cap. 1. pag. 28.*

b *Bel. lib. 3. de verb. Dei. cap 1.*

c *Greiser. defens. Bell. To. 1. lib. 3. cap. 1. col. 1117.*

plaine

plaine by his owne words: For speaking *of the propagation of Originall sinne and of Soules*, and being sore puzzled about the point, at length he concludes thus: *Illud credo quod etiam hinc (i. de hac re) diuinorum eloquiorum clarissima esset authoritas, si homo illud sine dispendio promissæ salutis ignorare non posset:* I verily perswade my selfe there should haue been plain proofe hereof in holy Scripture, if a man might not be ignorant thereof without danger of his saluation. And [e] *In ijs quæ apertè in Scriptura posita sunt, inueniuntur illa omnia quæ cõtinent fidem moresq́; viuendi:* All things concerning faith and manners are plainly set downe in Scripture, saith the same Saint *Austin*, vpon another occasion. Which latter testimony is so pregnant, that [f] *Costerus* the Iesuite is driuen by the euidence of it, and another such like testimony of Saint *Chrysostomes*, to deny there is any Controuersie betweene vs and them. *Sintne omnia fidei & vitæ Christianæ dogmata ad salutem necessaria in sacris literis perspicuè conscripta?* Whether all the Doctrines which concerne faith and manners, being necessary to saluation, are plainly set downe in Scripture? for *Illud affirmamus cum sanctis Chrysostomo & August.* Wee affirme so much with Saint *Chrysostome* and Saint *Augustine*.

d Lib. 2. de peccat. merit. &c. Cap. 36.

e Lib. 2. de doct. Christ. cap. 9.

f Apolog. pro 2. part. Enchirid. contra Gomar. cap. 6. pag. 356.

5 The Papists in some Countries [g] *absolutely forbid the People the reading of the Bible in their vulgar tongue, though it be neuer so Catholikely translated.* In [h] some, *they forbid only such to read Bibles Catholikely translated, who haue not expresse Licences vnder the hands of the Ordinaries to read them.* In no place will they permit euery man indifferently to read the Scriptures in their Mother Tongue, as we doe. Now that Saint *Austin* is of our opinion, it is plaine; for, *Eò mihi venerabilior & sacrosanctâ fide dignior apparebat authoritas (Scripturæ) quò omnibus ad legendum esset in promptu, verbis aptissimis & humilimo genere loquendi se cunctis præbens, &c.* I reuerenced and held the Scriptures worthy of so much the more credit, by how much the more I saw them readier for euery man to read, and that they framed themselues to euery mans capacity by the plainnesse of the words, and the familiarnesse of the Stile,

g Azorius instit. Moral. Part. 1. Lib. 8. Cap. 26. 3. quæritur.

h Rhem. Preface to the new Testament.

i 1. Confess. lib. 6. cap. 5.

saith

saith Saint *Austin*. And, k *Legite Scripturas; ideo voluit Deus vt scriberentur, vt nos consolaremur:* Read (saith hee, speaking out of the Pulpit to his Auditors) the Scriptures; for it was Gods will they should bee written, that wee might receiue comfort by them, saith the same man.

k *In Psal. 33. Serm. 2. post medium.*

6 The l Papists thinke it a worthy question, *How Scripture may be knowne to be Scripture?* Wee, vpon diuers good considerations, thinke it an idle question. And so did m Saint *Austin* for, *Persuasisti mihi non audiendos esse, si qui fortè mihi dicerent, vndè scis illos libros (Scripturæ) vnius veri & veracissimi Dei spiritu esse humano generi ministratos?* Thou (O God) didst perswade mee they deserued not so much as hearing, who did aske of me, how knowest thou that the Bookes of holy Scripture were giuen vnto the Church by Gods appointment?

l *Bell. lib. 4. de Verbo Dei, cap. 4.*

m *Confess. lib. 6. cap. 5.*

7 The n Papists teach, that *the true Church may bee knowne, by Antiquity, Vniuersality, Vnity, &c.* but not by the Scriptures onely infallibly. We say, it may be knowne by the Scriptures onely. And in this o Saint *Austin* is as cleare on our side as Mr. *Calvin*: for, *Inter nos & Donatistas quæstio est, vbi sit Ecclesia, vtrum apud nos, an apud illos?* It is a question betweene the *Donatists* and vs (saith hee) where the Church is; whether they or wee haue it? *Quid ergo facturi sumus? In verbis nostris eam quæsturi, an in verbis Capitis sui, Domini nostri Iesu Christi? Puto quòd in illius potius verbis eam quærere debeamus, qui verstas est, & optimè nouit corpus suum.* What therefore shall wee doe? Shall we seeke for it in our owne words, or in the words of her owne Head, our Lord Iesus Christ? I thinke wee ought to seeke it rather in his word, who is the truth, and best knoweth his owne body. And p afterwards, *Vtrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant, non nisi diuinarum Scripturarum libris ostendant;* If they bee the Church, let them make proofe thereof out of the Canonicall Bookes of Scripture onely, saith Saint *Austin*.

n *Bell. lib. 4. de Notis Ecclesiæ, cap. 4 &c.*

o *De Vnitate Ecclesiæ, cap. 2.*

p *De Vnitate Ecclesiæ cap. 16.*

8 The q Papists teach, *That by working of Miracles the Church may bee discerned.* But we teach the contrary: And so did Saint r *Austin*. For he professeth, that though many

q *Bell. lib. 4. de Notis Ecclesiæ, cap. 14.*

r *De Vnitate Ecclesiæ, cap. 16.*

many Miracles had beene done by them of his Religion; though ſome of them had beene *miraculouſly healed and cured: the bodies of ſome Martyrs lying hid for many yeeres diſcouered to Saint* Ambroſe, *an old man well knowne to all the Inhabitants of Millan, reſtored to his ſight vpon touching of the Beere whereon thoſe bodies were carried*; which is reckoned by [r] *Bellarmine* as a ſpeciall Miracle. Though ſome had ſeene *Viſions*, ſome had beene *rapt in ſpirit*, and *heard that either they ſhould not ioyne themſelues with Donatus*, or that they ſhould *forſake Donatus*; yet he and his fellowes *deſired not* (*in regard thereof*) *to bee beleeued they were the Church*, concluding; *Quacunque talia in Catholica fiunt, ideò ſunt approbanda, quia in Catholica fiunt, non ideò ipſa manifeſtatur Catholica, quia hæc in ea fiunt*: Though all ſuch Miracles are to be approued of, becauſe they are wrought in the Catholike Church; yet the Church is not proued Catholicke, becauſe ſuch Miracles are wrought in it.

[r] *Lib. 2. de Reliq. Cap. 3. Sect. 4.*

[r] *probatur.*

29 The [t] Papiſts denie, *That all the actions of Infidels are ſinne.* Yet wee ſay, they are ſinnes. And in this Saint [u] *Auſtin* is ſo apparantly on our ſide, that Papiſts are driuen to confeſſe it: For, *Sine fide etiam quæ videntur bona opera, in peccata vertuntur*: The Workes which are done without Faith, though they ſeeme good, are turned into ſinne, ſaith Saint *Auſtin* in one place. And in [x] another, *Virtutes quas ſibi animus habere videtur, per quas imperat corpori & vitijs, ad quodlibet adipiſcendum vel tenendum, niſi ad Deum retulerit, etiam ipſæ potiùs vitia ſunt quàm virtutes. Nam licèt à quibuſdam tunc veræ & honeſtæ putentur, cùm ad ſeipſas referuntur, nec propter aliud expetuntur, etiam tunc inflatæ & ſuperbæ ſunt, & ideò non virtutes, ſed vitia judicandæ ſunt*: The Vertues which the minde of him that knowes not God, ſeemes to haue, by which ſhee ſwayes the body and her vicious affections, if they be not referred to God, are indeed rather vices then vertues; for, though ſome hold them to bee true and reall vertues, when they are affected onely for their owne ſakes and nothing elſe; yet euen ſo they are full of vanity and pride, and to be adiudged vices, and not vertues, ſaith he. In which words, *Tam*

[t] *Rhem. Annot. Ro. 14.*

[u] *To. 7. cont. duas Epiſt. Pelag. ad Bonifac. li. 3. c. 5.*

[x] *To. 5. de Ciuit. Dei, lib. 19. c. 25.*

aperte virtutes has inter peccata numerat, vt nulla videntur tergiuersatione aliò posse torqueri, saith y Michael Baius, Professor of Diuinity in Louaine. And *Non sequenda illa opinio est, quam Trid. Conc. nuper meritò damnauit omnia Infidelium opera esse peccata, quamuis maximum Authorem D. Augustinum habuisse videatur:* Wee may not defend that opinion which the Councell of Trent did iustly of late condemne: *viz;* That all the actions of Infidels are sinne, though the great Father Saint *Austin* seems to haue been of that opinion, saith z *Maldonat.*

y De virtutibus impiorum, lib. 2. cap. 5. Impress. Louan. An. 1565.

z Comment. in Math. 7. 18.

10 The a Papists teach, *Some good workes may bee done by Infidels through the strength of nature onely.* We say, Nay. And for proofe of our Negatiue in this, wee alledge Saint *Austin*, who speaking of the Heretike *Pelagius*, writes thus: b *Interdum ita paribus momentis potestatem voluntatis aequa lance perpendit, vt aliquantulum etiam ad non peccandum valere definiat. Quod si ita est, nullus locus adiutorio gratiæ reseruatur, sine qua nos dicimus, ad non peccandum nihil voluntatis arbitrium habere:* Hee weighs sometimes the power of a mans will in such an euen payre of skales, as that hee teacheth it for truth; it is able to doe somewhat that may keepe a man from sinning; which, if it bee true, he leaues nothing to the helpe of Gods grace, without which, wee say, a mans Free-will is of no power to keepe a man from sinning. Vpon which words, c *Michael Baius* aboue named, glozeth thus: *Nos, inquit, igitur Pelagiorum vox est, potestatem voluntatis aliquantulum ad non peccandum valere: Christianorum verò professio est, sine adiutorio gratiæ ad non peccandum nihil valere voluntatis arbitrium.*

a Bell. de gra. & lib. Arbit. Lib. 5. cap. 9.

b To. 2. Ep. 106.

c De virtut imp. lib. 2. cap. 8.

12 The d Papists teach, *That some sinnes are veniall and pardonable of their owne nature*, such, for which God cannot in Iustice keepe a man out of Heauen, and adiudge him to the second death. But wee teach contrary. And so did Saint *Austin*, as e *Baius* the Professor of Diuinity at *Louaine* acknowledgeth: yea, and f *Ferdinandus Velosillus* also. For he hauing obserued how g *Austin* writes, That *Minuta plura peccata, si negliguntur, occidunt:* Many little

d See Rhem. Annot in Rom. 1. 31. & Azorius Instit. Moral. part. 1. lib. 4. cap. 8. 6. quæritur, &c.

e De meritis operum, lib. 2. c. 8.

f Aduertent in To. 9. Aug. ad 3. quæsitum p. 191.

g Tract. 1. in Ioh.

little sinnes (the Papists call them Veniall) if men be [illegible] lesse of them, kill the Soule: deliuering his opinion of the words, saith thus. h *Pro Augustino respondemus, quod quando dicit, Quod plura peccata minuta, si negliguntur occidunt: agebat vicem concionatoris, qui vt populum à peccatis retrahant, grauitatem delictorum exaggerantes, in odium delicti, sæpe excedunt.* To *Austin* I answere, that when hee spake such words, he spake them as a Preacher, who in hatred of sinne, and out of a desire to affright men from sinne, doe sometimes so exaggerate the grieuousnesse of sinne, that they speake ouer.

12 The i Papists teach, That *Pœna damni*, not *Pœna sensus, is due to Originall sinne.* Wherefore they generally teach, That children dying in Originall sinne, are punished onely with *Pœna damni*, but not with *Pœna sensus* But we say, That such children as dye in Originall sinne, are punished with *Pœna sensus*, & not with *Pœna damni* onely. For in our opinion, *Pœna sensus*, and not *Pœna damni* only, is due to Originall sin. And of our opinion S. *Austin* was. For (to omit what is written, *To.* 3. *Operũ Augusti, de fide ad Pel. Cap.* 27 and *To.* 10. *de verb. Apostoli, Serm.* 13. *and* 14. *and To.* 7. *Hypognosticon, Lib.* 5. which sound so fully, that the Iesuite *Azorius* had no way to elude the testimonies, but by denying some of the Bookes to bee Saint *Austins*, and by making doubt of other some) in a knowne and an approued worke of his, k he writes thus. *Quicunque ab illa perditionis massa quæ facta est per hominem primum non liberantur per vnum Mediatorem Dei & hominem, resurgent quidem etiam ipsi vnusquisque cum sua carne: sed vt cum Diabolo & angelis eius puniantur:* Whosoeuer they be that are not deliuered from the Masse of corruption, which was caused by *Adam*, through the means of that our Mediator betweene God and man, euery of them shall rise againe in their owne flesh, yet to that end they may be punished with the Diuell and his Angels. Which last words, *to be punished with the Diuell and his angels*, imply necessarily *Pœnam sensus*.

i *Azorius Instit. Moral. part.* 1. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 33. 1. *quæritur, pag.* 302.

k *Enchirid. ad Lawrent. cap.* 92.

13 The Papiſts teach, *That our workes are meritorious, and the very cauſe of Saluation. But we ſay, they are not.* In this St.[m] *Auſtin* is ſo plaine on our ſide, ſaying, *Coronat te, quia dona ſua coronat, non merita tua.* He crownes thee, because he crownes his gifts, not thy merits: that [n] *Biſhop* the Prieſt denyes there is any ſuch ſaying in Saint *Auſtine* as this is. *Saint* Auſtin *was too wiſe to let any ſuch fooliſh ſentence to paſſe his pen,* ſaith *Biſhop*.

m *In Pſal.* 102.

n In his former part of his Reformation of a Catholike deformed, Pag. 97.

14 The [o] Papiſts teach, *That there are ſeuen Sacraments of the Church, truely and properly ſo called, and neither mo nor fewer.* We teach, that in true and proper ſenſe, there are onely two Sacraments of the Church; neither mo, nor fewer. Now that S. *Auſtine* is of our opinion herein, his words ſhew: for in [p] one place he affirmes, that, *de latere Chriſti in cruce pendentis lancea percuſſo, Sacramenta Eccleſiæ profluxerunt*: When Chriſts ſide was pierced with a Speare, the Sacraments of the Church iſſued thereout. And in [q] another, that *percuſſum eſt latus, & ſtatim manarunt ſanguis & aqua, quæ ſunt Eccleſiæ gemina Sacramenta*: Chriſts ſide was pierced, and immediately there guſhed out both blood and water, which are the two Sacraments of the Church. Hee meaning the Lords Supper, by bloud; by water, Baptiſme.

o *Con. Trid. Seſſ. 7. de Sacram. in genere, Can.* 1.

p *Tract.* 15. *in Ioh.* 2.

q *De Symb. ad Catechum. c.* 6.

15 The [r] Papiſts teach, *That Women may baptize.* And wee teach the contrary. Now that Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion heerein, it is plaine by this; That in [s] the fourth Councell at *Carthage*, whereunto he ſubſcribed, it was abſolutely decreed, [t] *Mulier baptizare ne præſumat*: Let not women baptize, and not with limitation, as [u] *Gratian* and *Lombard* corruptly cite it, *Mulier baptizare ne præſumat, niſi neceſſitate cogente*: Let not women baptize, except in caſes of neceſsity.

r *Bel. Lib.* 1. *de Bapt. cap.* 7.

s *Can.* 100.

t *De conſecrat. d.* 4. *c. Mulier*

u *Lib.* 4 *ſent. d.* 6. *A.*

16 The [x] Papiſts teach, That Saint *Paul* by the Lords Supper, 1. *Cor.* 11. meant not the *Euchariſt*, *and that moſt great Authors now are of that opinion.* But we teach the contrary. And notwithſtanding [y] one of them would impudently face vs downe, that in calling the Eucharist by the name of the Lords Supper, we are deſtitute of all proofe

x *Rhem. Annot. in* 1. *Cor.* 11. 20.

y *Sine Scripturæ authoritate, ſine veterum patrum exemplo, ſine ratione, nullo iudicio. Maldonat. Comment. in Math.* 26. 26.

out

out of Scripture, and of all warrant from the Ancient Fathers, and of all reaſon: yet [z] *Cardinall Baronius* witneſſeth with vs, that, *Idem eſſe manducare Cœnam Dominicam quod Euchariſtiam ſumere* [a] *Auguſtinus demonſtrat.* *Auſtin* proues manifeſtly, to eate the Lords Supper, and to receiue the Euchariſt, are both one, making this note (as it were) by the way *Sic Patres appellare conſueuerunt inſtitutionem ſacratiſſimæ Euchariſtiæ.* So the Fathers were wont to call the Euchariſt. Ouer againſt which, in the Margent, is ſet: *Omnes qui interpretati ſunt locum* 1 *Cor.* 11. Euen all the Fathers which haue written Commentaries vpon 1. *Cor.* 11.

z *Annal. To.* 1. *ad An.* 34. *Nu.* 45.
a *Epiſt.* 118. *cap.* 7. *& lib.* 2. *c.* 7. *de ſer. do. in monte.*

17 The [b] Papiſts teach, *That the Sacrament is their Lord and God.* But we teach the contrary. Wee ſay with Saint [c] *Auſtin*, it is *Panis Domini* not *Panis Dominus*: The Bread of the Lord; but not Bread, our Lord. Where S. *Auſtine* makes a compariſon betweene the receiuing of *Iudas*, and of the reſt of the Apoſtles; he, *Panem Domini*; they, *Panem Dominum*, not orally, but Sacramentally.

b *Allen de Euch. ſacr ficio, cap.* 4. *Brijio. Motiuo.* 26.
c *Tract.* 59. *in Ioh. paulo poſt principium.*

18 The [d] Papiſts forced *Berengarius* to ſweare by the bleſſed Trinity, that he beleeued; *Verum corpus & ſanguinem Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, fidelium dentibus atteri*: the true body and blood of our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt, is torne with Chriſtian mens teeth, when they receiue the Sacrament: Yet we beleeue with Saint *Auſtin*, that *Chriſtum vorari dentibus fas non eſt*: It is not lawfull for a Chriſtian to teare Chriſt with his teeth. Which opinion is ſo contrary to that of *Berengarius*, that the Glozer had no way to reconcile them, but was driuen to confeſſe, that *Berengarius hyperbolice loquutus eſt, & veritatem exceſſit*: vſed an Hyperbole, and ſpake more then the truth.

d *Apud Gratian. de Conſecrat. d.* 2. *Ego Berengarius.*
c *Apud Gratian. de Conſecrat. d.* 2. *vtrum ſub figura* ſ *Gloſſ. in* 2. *d. de Conſecrat. c. vtrum ſub figura verbo vocari.*

19 The Papiſts cannot brooke to heare, that our Sauiours ſaying: *This is my Body*, meant, *This is a ſigne of my Body.* Yet we ſay his meaning was ſuch. And ſo doth Saint *Auſtin*: For, *Non dubitauit Dominus dicere, Hoc eſt corpus meum, cùm ſignum daret corporis ſui.* Our Lord did not doubt to ſay, This is my Body, when he gaue the ſigne of his Body, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. With which words the

h *Contra Adimantium. ca.* 12.

Papiſts are ſo troubled, i that ſome of them haue made queſtion, whether they were not heretofore patched into Saint *Auſtins* Workes, by ſome follower of *Berengarius:* and k others haue bin forced to ſhift them off, vnder pretence, that Saint *Auſtin in fighting againſt the Manichees, oftentimes vſeth not his owne ſenſe, but thoſe things which by ſome meanes, howſoeuer it were, might ſeeme to giue him aduantage then; ſo as he might put them to the worſe.*

i *Teſte Torrenſi in Confeſſ. Auguſtiniana, lib. 3. cap. 6. pag. 322.*

k *Hardings* Anſwere to Mr. *Iewels* Challenge, *Art.* 12. *p.* 134.

20 The l Papiſts affirme, that it is an impudent forgery to write, *that the Iews receiued no leſſe the truth and ſubſtance of Chriſt in their Sacrament, then we doe in ours:* Yet wee write and teach ſo. And ſo did Saint m *Auſtin:* for *Eundem cibum ſpiritualem manducauerunt. Quid eſt eundem, niſi quod eum, quem etiam nos?* The Apoſtle affirmes (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) that they (the Iewes) ate the ſame ſpirituall meat: what meanes he to ſay the ſame, but that they ate that which we alſo eate? And a little after, *Suffecerat vt diceret, cibum ſpiritualem manducauerunt, eundem inquit, eundem non intelligo quomodo intelligendum, niſi eum, quem manducamus & nos:* It had beene ſufficient to haue ſaid, They ate ſpirituall meate; but he ſaith more, they ate the ſame. I cannot tell how I ſhould vnderſtand that word [*the ſame,*] except he meane, they ate the ſame: for that they ate the ſame which we do eate. And n in another place, *Apoſtolum audi.* Harken what the Apoſtle ſaith, ſaith S. *Auſtin. Omnes eandem eſcam ſpiritualem manducauerunt, ſpiritualem vtiq; eandem; nam corporalem alteram: quia illi, Manna: nos aliud, ſpiritualem verò quam nos:* They all ate the ſame ſpirituall meat; marke, the ſame ſpirituall meate; for they ate not the ſame corporall meate: they ate *Manna*, wee eate another thing; but they ate the ſame ſpirituall meate which we eate. Which words are ſo ſignificant and expreſſe for vs, that o *Maldonate* confeſſeth, Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion; though yet in his perſwaſion, if *Auſtin* had liued in our dayes, he would haue beene of another opinion: for, *Hoc dico,* (ſaith the Ieſuite) *perſuaſum me habere D. Auguſtinum, ſi noſtra fuiſſet ætate, longè aliter ſenſurum.* You muſt thinke he wanted a Ieſuite to informe him better.

l *Rhem. Annot. in* 1 *Cor.* 10. 3.

m *De vtilitate pœnitentiæ. ca.* 1.

n *Tract.* 26. *in Iob.*

o *Comment. in Iob.* 6. 49. *col.* 629.

21 The

21 The p Papiſts teach, That *Accidents remaine in the Sacrament without ſubiects*, And we teach contrary. Now if the Booke *Soliloquiorum* be Saint *Auſtins*, as q *Bellarm.* ſaith it is, Saint *Auſtin* is ours in this: For thus that r Author writes therein. *Quis conceſſerit, aut cui poſſe fieri videatur, vt id quod in ſubiecto eſt, maneat, ipſo intereunte ſubiecto? Monſtruoſum enim & à veritate alieniſsimum eſt, vt id quod non eſſet, niſi in ipſo eſſet, etiam cùm ipſum non fuerit, poſsit eſſe:* Who can grant, or to whom can it ſeeme probable, that that which is in a ſubiect, ſhould remaine when the ſubiect is deſtroyed? It is monſtrous, and farre from all ſhew of truth, that that which ſhould haue no beeing, vnleſſe it were in ſuch a ſubiect, ſhould haue a beeing, euen when that ſubiect hath no beeing.

p *Bell. lib. 3. de Eucha. cap. 24.*
q *De ſcript. Eccl. verbo Auguſtin.*
r *Soliloq lib. 2. Cap. 12.*

22 The ſ Papiſts at this day teach, *That the Sacrifice offered in the Communion, or Maſſe, as they call it, is a very ſoueraigne, true, and proper Sacrifice*, meaning thereby, *That Chriſt is killed there indeed, and ſacrificed to God.* But wee ſay, That therein there is only made a Commemoration of the true, and ſoueraigne and proper Sacrifice of the Croſſe, and not an Oblation of the true and ſoueraigne proper Sacrifice it ſelfe. And with vs ſtands t Saint *Auſtin*: For firſt, *In ſingulari & ſolo vero Sacrificio, pro nobis Chriſti ſanguis effuſus eſt:* That is the onely and true ſoueraigne Sacrifice, wherein Chriſts Blood was ſhed for vs, ſaith Saint *Auſtin* Now in the Communion or Maſſe, no blood is ſhed. Secondly, u *Huius Sacrificij Caro & Sanguis ante aduentum Chriſti, per victimas ſimilitudinum promittebatur, in paſsione Chriſti per ipſam veritatem reddebatur: Poſt aſcenſum Chriſti, per Sacramentum memoria celebratur:* The fleſh and blood of the Sacrifice of Chriſt, was promiſed by Sacrifices of reſemblance before hee came, was performed in truth and deed when he ſuffered: is celebrated by a Sacrament of remembrance. (marke, a Sacrament of remembrance) ſince he aſcended, ſaith the ſame Saint *Auſtin* in another place. In which he is ſo conſtant and ſo plaine, that x *Peter Lombard*, Maſter of the Sentences, propoſing this queſtion: *Si quod gerit Sacerdos proprie, dicatur ſacrificium vel immolatio?*

ſ *Allan. de Euch. Sacrificio, cap. 10. & 13.*
t *Lib. 1. contra Aduerſar. Legis & Prophet. cap. 18.*
u *Lib. 20. cap. 21. cont. Fauſtum Manich.*
x *Lib. 4. ſent. d. 12. G.*

immolatio? Whether that which the Prieſt doth execute, be properly called a Sacrifice or an Oblation? reſolues, it is not, ſaying: *Ad hoc breuiter dici poteſt, illud quod offertur & conſecratur à ſacerdote, vocari ſacrificium & oblationem, quia memoria eſt & repræſentatio veri Sacrificij & ſanctæ immolationis factæ in ara Crucis:* To this I anſwere briefely, That that which is offered and conſecrated by the Prieſt, is called a Sacrifice and an offering, becauſe it is a remembrance and repreſentation of the true Sacrifice and holy Offering made on the Altar of the Croſſe, grounding his concluſion vpon other teſtimonies in Saint *Auſtin*, and in Saint *Chryſoſtome*.

y *In Pſal. 21. in 1 reſat. Expoſit. 2. & Epiſt. 23. ad Bonifacium. 2 Hom. 17. in Heb.*

24 The Papiſts teach, *That the body of our Lord may be in millions of places at one time*; euen in euery place where there is a Prieſt that conſecrates, and in euery hoſt (bee they neuer ſo many) which is conſecrated by any Prieſt. But we teach contrary: and ſo did S. *Auſtin*: for hee intending to ſhew the difference betweene Chriſts Body and his Truth, *viz.* his Word: and that in reſpect of the places where they might be found. *Donec ſæculum finietur ſurſum eſt dominus; ſed etiam tamen hic nobiſcum eſt veritas domini. Corpus enim domini in quo ſurrexit in vno loco eſſe oportet, veritas autem eius vbique diffuſa eſt:* Till Doomes day, ſaith he, our Lord is aboue; yet the truth of the Lord is with vs: for our Lords body in which he aroſe from the dead, muſt be in one place, but his truth is in euery place.

b *Tract. 30. in Iob.*

In the printed Copies which I haue ſeene, for Domini, is read Dominus, and for oportet, poteſt. But Algerius de Sacram. c. 14. Lombard. in 4. ſent. d. 10. Grat. De Conſec. d. 2. prima quidem, read as I haue cited it.

25 The c Papiſts teach, *That euill men, euen Infidels*; yea, *brute beaſts, may eate and drinke the Body and Blood of Chriſt*: But we ſay, Nay. Now Saint *Auguſtine* ſpeakes plainely for vs: For, *Ipſe (Chriſtus) dicens, Qui manducat carnem meam, & bibit ſanguinem meum, in me manet, & ego in eo: oſtendit quid ſit non Sacramento tenus, ſed revera Corpus Chriſti manducare, & eius ſanguinẽ bibere: hoc eſt enim in Chriſto manere, vt in illo maneat & Chriſtus: ſic enim hoc dixit, tanquam diceret: Qui non in me manet, & in quo ego non maneo, non ſe dicat, aut exiſtimet manducare Corpus meum aut bibere Sanguinem meum.* When Chriſt ſaid (ſaith S. *Auguſtine*) Hee that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my

c *Rhem. Annot. in 1 Cor. 11. 27.*

d *De Ciuitate Dei, Lib. 21. c. 25.*

my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him: he ſhewed what it is to receiue Chriſt (not Sacramentally meerely, but) truely: euen to dwell in Chriſt, that Chriſt may alſo dwell in him. For when hee ſaid this, it was as much as if hee had ſaid: Hee that dwelleth not in me, nor I in him, let him not ſay nor thinke, that he eates my fleſh or drinkes my blood.

26 The Papiſts at Rome teach, *That the Pope is in authority aboue a generall Councell.* But we teach the contrary: And ſo did S. *Auſtin.* For hee putting the caſe, that *Melchaides*, Biſhop of Rome, and certain other Biſhops ſitting in Commiſſion with him (by the Emperours commandement) vpon a Controuerſie betweene the *Donatiſts* and *Cecilian*, had done the *Donatiſts* wrong, in giuing ſentence againſt them, and for *Cecilian*. *Reſtabat adhuc plenarium Eccleſiæ vniuerſæ concilium, vbi etiam cum ipſis iudicibus cauſa poſſet agitari, vt ſi male iudicaſſe conuicti eſſent, eorum ſententia ſolueretur:* There remained (ſaith hee) a further helpe for them, euen a generall Councell, in which they might haue argued the caſe with the Commiſsioners appointed to be their Iudges: and procured reuerſement of their iudgement, vpon proofe they had iudged vniuſtly. Which words are ſo pregnant for our poſition, that g Cardinall *Cuſan*, and diuers other Papiſts, alledge them for proofe of the ſame concluſion.

Tom. 2. Epiſt. 162.

g *De concordan. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 17. Æneas Syluius comment. de geſt. Baſil. Concil. l. 1*

27 The h Papiſts teach, *That any man who thinkes himſelfe wronged, may appeale to Rome.* But wee teach, they ſhould not. Now that Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion, it is plaine: For he was one of the Councell of *Milenis*, wherein it was decreed, That if any Elder, or Deacon, or Clergy-man of inferiour ſtate, appealed ouer-Sea (meaning to the Pope) no man in *Africa* ſhould communicate with him. The words of the i Canon running thus: *Placuit vt Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores Clerici in cauſis quas habuerint, vicini Epiſcopi eos audiant, & inter eos quicquid eſt finiant, &c. quod ſi ab eis prouocandum putauerint, non prouocent niſi ad Africana Concilia, vel ad primatus prouinciarum ſuarum. Ad tranſmarina autem qui putauerint*

h *2. q. 6. ad Bo. Eccleſiam.*

i *Can. 22.*

appellandum, à nullo intra Africam in communionem ſuſcipiantur. Which words ſound ſo fully for vs, and againſt the Papiſts, that though [k] *Gracian* in one place cites them ſimply and truely, as they are in ſeuerall editions of the Councels: yet in [l] another place, he patcheth to them certaine words of his own, *viz. niſi forte Romanam ſedem appellauerint*, unleſſe perhaps any appeale to Rome, endeauouring therely to make the world beleeue, that Saint *Auſtin* and his Colleagues allowed of Appeales to Rome, and denyed them to other places only. Whereas (by the confeſsion of [m] *Theodorus Balſamon*, yea, of [n] *Bellarmine*) that Canon ally made to reſtraine Appeales of Ealders and Deacons to Rome.

k C.11.q.3. preſbiter.
l Cap.2.q. placuit vt presbyteri.
m Scholis in Synod.Carthag. Can. 31.
n Lib. 2. de Ro. Pont.c. 24.

28 The [o] Papiſts teach, *That all Biſhops may* (doubtleſſe) *appeale to Rome*. But wee deny this alſo. And no queſtion, but Saint *Auſtin* denyed it in his time: for in the Canon before cited, to which he ſubſcribed, we [p] read, that the Biſhops profeſſed, what they decreed then touching the reſtraining of Elders and Deacons, &c. from appealing to Rome: the ſame *De Epiſcopis ſæpe definitum eſt*, they had often decreed touching Biſhops. In Saint *Auſtins* opinion, it was no more lawfull for Biſhops, then for the *inferiour Clergie*, to appeale to Rome.

o Cap.2.q.6. omnes Epiſcopi.
p Synod. Carthag. Gentiano Herueto Interpret.Can. 31. impreſſ. Pariſ. 1561. pag. 327.

29 The Papiſts teach, *That the Pope may abſolue ſuch from Excommunication, as are excommunicated by others*. But we teach, he cannot. Now that Saint [r] *Auſtin* was of our mind in this, it is plaine. For, he, with others in their Epiſtle to Pope *Celeſtin*, charge him with * doing that which he ought not to haue done: in that he reſtored *Apiarius* vnto the Communion, whom they had reſtrained there-from; in treating him he would no more * abſolue ſuch as were excommunicated by them, alledging this as a reaſon, *viz. Hoc in Nicæna Synodo definitum, &c.* It was agreed vpon in the Councell of [s] Nicé, *Qui ab alijs abiecti, ab alijs non admittendi*: Such as were excommunicated by one, ſhould not be abſolued by another.

r Conc. African cap.105.
* Quod minime fecit.
* In Communionem recipere.
s Can. 5.

30 The [t] Papiſts teach, *That the Pope may ſend his Legats into Prouinces afarre off, to decide Controuerſies amongſt*

t Moſconius de maieſtate Militantis Eccleſiæ lib. 1. de Cardinal. cap. 6.

the Clergie. We teach, he might doe better to keepe them at home. And that Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion, it is cleere by the Epiſtle formerly cited, which he and two other Biſhops writ to Pope *Celeſtin:* for therein, hauing ſignified vnto him, they could not finde it decreed by any Councell, that he ſhould ſend any Legats into other Countries; they deſire him in that reſpect to ſend no ſuch Legats, immitating vnto him, that it ſmelt of pride and ſmoking ſtatelineſſe in the world. With which ſpeeches of his and his fellow Biſhops, the Papiſts are wonderfully offended. [u] *Stapleton* ſaith, It is *manifeſtè falſum*, a ſtarke lye: that no ſuch decree is to be found in any Councell. *Hîc à craſſa ignorantia excuſari vix poſſunt:* In this, Saint *Auſtin* and his fellow Biſhops can hardly be excuſed frō groſſe ignorance. And whereas they ſaid, ſuch ſending of Legats ſmelt of worldly pride: *temerè prolatum fuiſſe manifeſtum eſt:* It is euident they ſpoke raſhly, ſaith the ſame *Stapleton.*

[u] *Relect. princip. fidei doctrinal. cont. 3. q. 7. ad 1. Arg. pag. 412. & 413.*

31 The Papiſts grant, that *Prouinciall Councels* may erre: but they will not grant that their Pope can erre. But wee ſay, that in as much as *Prouinciall Councels* are ſubiect to erring, no doubt their Pope is ſubiect to erring. Wherein Saint *Auſtin* concurreth in opinion with vs: For Hee, and his fellow Biſhops, in their Epiſtle to *Celeſtin*, thought it abſurd, that any man ſhould imagine God would inſpire the tryall of right into one man, & deny it to a great number of Biſhops aſſembled in a Councell. Which makes ſo fully for our aſſertion, that [y] *Stapleton* ſaith bluntly, *Non eſt abſurdum quod illi Africani abſurdum exiſtimauerunt.* It is not abſurd, which the Fathers of Africa thought abſurd. And, *Non neceſſario tenemur credere quicquid Epiſcopi illi dicunt,---præſertim cum ſatis appareat,---eos modum in verbis nonnihil exceſſiſſe:* Wee are not of neceſsity to beleeue whatſoeuer thoſe Biſhops ſpake, conſidering it is plaine, they ouerſhot themſelues much in their words, ſaith [z] *Bellarmine.*

[y] *Lib. ſupra citat. ad 3. Arg. p. 413.*

[z] *Lib. 4. de Rom. pont. cap. 6.*

32 The [a] Papiſts teach, that a *generall Councell* cannot erre in matters of faith. But we ſay the contrary. Now

[a] *Turrecremat. ſumm. de Eccl. lib 3. cap. 58.*

Saint *Auſtin* diſputing againſt the *Donatiſts*, about a point of faith, *viz.* whether ſuch as were baptized by Hereticks and Schiſmaticks were rightly baptized: and being preſſed by the *Donatiſts* with a Decree of *Prouinciall Councell*, held by *Cyprian*; in which it was affirmed, that ſuch as were baptized by Hereticks or Shiſmaticks, were not rightly baptized: he falls into a ſingular commendation of Scripture, preferring it before al the writings of the Fathers, either ſingle, or aſſembled in Councels, [b] ſhewing that the ſingle writings of the Fathers may bee corrected by Councels: Prouinciall Councels by generall Councels: and that euen generall Councels themſelues may often bee amended, the former by the latter, when by ſome experience of things, that is opened which before was ſhut, and that knowne which before was vnknowne. Which argues Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion, That a generall Councell may erre in a matter of faith.

[b] *Lib. 2. de Bapt. contr. Donat. ca. 3.*

33 The [c] Papiſts ſay, that the firſt *Nicen* Councell made 80. Canons. We ſay, they made but 20. Now that Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion heerein, it appeares by this, That hee and his fellow Biſhops in the [d] ſixth Councell at Carthage, and [e] the African, acknowledged no moe then 20. Hee and his fellow Biſhops held, that the Copies of the Nicen Canons which were ſent them from Alexandria and Conſtantinople, in which there were 20. Canons onely, were the trueſt copies. For this Teſtimony is ſo euident, that the Papiſts haue no way to auoid it handſomly, but are driuen to ſay rudely, [f] *Non debuerunt patres Africani hæc exemplaria pro veriſſimis venditare*: The Fathers of Africa ought not to haue accounted theſe copies (ſent thē from Alexandria and Conſtantinople) the trueſt copies.

[c] *Lindan. Panop. lib. 4. cap. 89.*

[d] *Cap. 9.*

[e] *Can. 102.*

[f] *Stapleton Reſol. Controu. 3. q. 7. ad 1. Arg. pag. 412.*

34 The [a] Papiſts teach, *That we may beleeue in Saints*: And we teach the contrary. Now ſo did Saint *Auſtin* [b]: for *Credimus Paulo, ſed non credimus in Paulum: credimus Petro, ſed non credimus in Petrum*: We beleeue (ſaith hee) Saint *Paul*, but we beleeue not in Saint *Paul*: We beleeue Saint *Peter*, but wee beleeue not in Saint *Peter*.

[a] *Bel. li. 1. de ſanct. beatit. c. 20. Rhem. Annot. in Rom. 10. 14.*

[b] *Tract. 29. in Ioh.*

35 The [c] Papiſts approue *of the erection of Altars vnto Saints*,

[c] *Veloſillus Aduerſ. in To. 6. Aug. ad 5. Queſtium p. 439. Lorinus Marie Auguſtæ l. 4. cap. 1. p. 397.*

Saints, which we doe not, nor [d] Saint *Auſtin*; for *Nulli Martyrum, ſed ipſi Deo Martyrum conſtituimus altaria*: We build Altars to him who is the God of Martyrs, but not to any of the Martyrs, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*.

d *Cont. Fauſtum Manich. lib. 20. cap. 21.*

36 The [e] Papiſts teach, *That Temples may bee built to Saints*: But we teach, that Temples, or Churches, as wee call them, ſhould bee built to God onely. So did [f] *Auſtin*; *Nonnè ſi Templum alicui ſancto Angelo excellentiſſimo de lignis & lapidibus faceremus, anathematizaremur à veritate Chriſti, & ab Eccleſia Dei, quoniam creaturæ exhiberemus eam ſeruitutem quæ vni tantùm debetur Deo?* If wee ſhould build a Church of wood and ſtone to one of the chiefeſt Angels, ſhould wee not bee anathematized of Chriſt and of his Church, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*, ſeeing in doing ſo, we ſhould giue that honour vnto a creature, which is due onely vnto the Creator? Which words are ſo contrary to the Popiſh practice of building Churches to Saints (which practice of building proceeds from their opinion of the lawfulneſſe thereof) that [g] *Eraſmus* ſet this Note ouer againſt them in the margent, *Hoc nunc fit quibuſlibet diuis*: intimating, that howeuer *Auſtin* thought it Idolatrous to build Churches to the chiefeſt Angels; yet now there were Churches built to euery of the Saints. With which his free confeſsion, it tending to the ſhame of Popery, the [h] Papiſts are ſo much offended, that in their Purgatory Indices, direction is giuen that his words bee blotted out.

e *Locrius Mariæ Auguſtæ, l. 4. c. 26*

f *Lib. 1. cont. Maximin. Arianum Epiſcopum.*

g *In edit. Aug. Anno 1562.*

h *Deleantur illa verba, Hoc nunc fit quibuſlibet diuis. Index. Hiſpa. fol. 5. b.*

37 The [i] Papiſts teach, *That our Sauiour Chriſt, after the reſurrection, did firſt appeare vnto his mother*, aſſuring themſelues, [k] *Nemo pius negarit*, No honeſt man wil deny it. Yet we deny it, and ſo doth S. *Auſtin*: For, ſpeaking thereof, [l] *Mariæ Magdalenæ dignatus eſt primitus apparere*; Chriſt (ſaith hee) vouchſafed to appeare firſt vnto *Mary Magdalen*.

i *Bernardinus de Buſti in Mariali part. 10. ſect. 2. de gaudijs Mariæ. part. 5.*

k *Baron. Annal. To. 1 ad An. 34. Nu. 183.*

l *In Pſal. 58. in expoſ. 1. part.*

38 The [m] Papiſts generally teach at this day, *That the Virgin Mary was not conceiued in originall ſinne*. And wee teach the contrary. Now that theſe words of [n] *Auſtin*, *Quicunq; naſcitur proles (ex concupiſcentia carnis) originali obli-*

m *Bel. lib. 3. de Cultu ſanct. cap. 16. ad 2.*

n *De nuptijs & concupiſcent. cap. 34.*

obligata eſt peccato: Whatſoeuer child is borne by concupiſcence of the fleſh, the ſame is infected with originall ſin; proue that the Virgin *Mary* was conceiued in ſinne, it is confeſſed by [o] diuers Papiſts. And by the ſame men it is confeſſed in like manner, that the ſame concluſion is proued by theſe words: [p] *Firmiſſimè tene, & nullatenus dubites, omnem hominem, qui per concubitum viri & mulieris concipitur, cum peccato originali naſci:* Beleeue thou this for a certaine truth, that whoſoeuer is gotten by coniunction of man and woman, he or ſhe is borne with originall ſinne.

39 The [q] Papiſts teach, *Fide Catholica credi Deiparam ſemper virginem in ſanctitate natam eſſe:* That it is one point of the Catholicke faith, to beleeue that the Virgin *Mary* was holy, euen when ſhe was borne. But we thinke not ſo. Neither did Saint *Auſtin* thinke ſo. For, *Fieri nullo modo poteſt, vt quis renaſcatur, antequam naſcatur:* It cannot bee poſsibly ([r] ſaith *Auſtin*) that a man ſhould bee borne againe, before he be borne: which ſentence doth ſo diſtaſte the Ieſuite *Vaſquez*, that [ſ] he profeſſeth; *Nulli Catholicorum ita licet opinari:* No Catholicke may thinke ſo.

40 The [t] Papiſts teach, that *Ex ſpeciali Dei priuilegio*, By an eſpeciall priuiledge granted by God, *the Virgin Mary was freed from all ſinne.* [u] *She had ſo much grace giuen her, that ſhe neuer ſinned ſo much as venially.* But wee teach the contrary; and ſo (doubtleſſe) did Saint *Auſtin*. For ſpeaking of Chriſt, *Nullus eſt hominum præter ipſum, qui peccatum non fecerit grandioris ætatis acceſſu, quia nullus eſt hominum præter ipſum, qui peccatum non habuerit infantilis ætatis exortu:* There was neuer any man but Chriſt (ſaith [x] Saint *Auſtin*) who ſinned not in his elder yeeres, becauſe no man but Chriſt was free from ſinne in his Infancie. And in another place, diſcourſing vpon the words, *Iohn* 2. 4. *Woman, what haue I to doe with thee?* he y brings in our Sauiour ſaying vnto her thus, *Non competit tibi vt iubeas Deo; competit autem vt ſubdita ſis Deo:* It becomes thee not to command God; it becomes thee to be ſubiect vnto God. Which words argue, that hee reproued her; and by conſequence, that ſhee made ſome fault. For, *Vbi nulla culpa*

o See *Pel. de Vincentia de B. virg. concept. duo centorum & ſexdecem ſanctæ matris Eccleſiæ, doctorum, vera, tuta, & tenenda ſententia.*

p *De fide ad Petrum. cap. 26.*

q *Azorius inſtit. Moral. part. 2. lib. 1. c. 19. 2. quæritur.*

r *Epiſt. 57.*

ſ *To. 2. in 3. part. Tho. q. 27. Art. 2. diſput. 115. cap. 4.*

t *Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 6. cap. 23.*

u *Rhem. annot. in Marc. 3. 33.*

x *Lib. 5. cont. Iulianum. cap. 9.*

y *Lib. 2. de Symb. ad Catechum. cap. 5.*

culpa eſt, nec reprehenſio, aut increpatio locum habet: Where no fault is committed, no checke or reproofe ſhould bee vſed; as [z] Cardinall *Tolet* obſerueth.

z *Comment. in Iob. 2. Annot. 5.*

41 The [a] Papiſts teach, *That it is lawfull to repreſent God in the Image of an old man.* And wee teach the contrary; and ſo did Saint *Auſtin.* For ſpeaking of their ſacriledge, who turned the glory of the incorruptible God, into the ſimilitude of a corruptible man, *Nefas eſt collocare tale ſimulachrum Deo:* It is a foule fault to expreſſe God in ſuch an Image, ſaith [b] Saint *Auſtin.*

a *Bel. lib. 2. de imag. cap. 8.*

b *To. 3. de fide & ſymb. cap. 7.*

42 As the Papiſts allow of repreſenting God in the Image of an old man; ſo they allow *of the worſhipping of ſuch Images.* For [c] *Caietan* ſpeaking of the Images of God, and of Chriſt, &c. *Hæc non ſolum pinguntur, vt oſtendantur (ſicut Cherubin olim in Templo) ſed vt adorentur, vt frequens vſus Eccleſiæ teſtatur:* Theſe Images (ſaith hee) are made, not for ſhew (as the Cherubins in the Temple in times paſt) but to the end they may bee worſhipped, as the vſuall practice of the Church ſheweth. But we teach the contrary; and ſo did Saint *Auſtin.* For, *Nulla imago Dei colí debet niſi illa, quæ hoc eſt vt ipſe:* No Image of God may be worſhipped ([d] ſaith hee) but that which is all one with himſelfe, meaning Chriſt Ieſus: *Coloſ.* 1. 15. and *Heb.* 1. 3.

c *Comment. in 3. part. Tho. q. 25. Art. 3. pag. 139. Edit. Stelſ. Anno 1567.*

d *To. 2. Epiſtola 119. ad Ianuarium, cap. 11.*

43 The [e] Papiſts teach, *That the Images of Saints may bee worſhipped, euen with that worſhip which is due to the Saint himſelfe, dulia, hyperdulia.* But we teach the contrary; and ſo (it ſeemes) did [f] Saint *Auſtin.* For he ſpeaking of ſuperſtitious and euill-lyued Chriſtians, who liued in the Church, whom the Church diſliked much, and laboured to reclaime; comprehends a many of them vnder *picturarum adoratores,* worſhippers of Images: which toucheth the Papiſts ſo neere the quicke, that [g] *Bellarmines* beſt Anſwer is, *Aug: ſcripſiſſe eum librum in primordijs conuerſionis ſuæ ad fidem Catholicam, &c.* Saint *Auſtin* writ that Booke alledged preſently after his conuerſion to Chriſtianity, at what time hee thought many cuſtomes to be idolatrous, which vpon better information he held tolerable.

e *Naclantus enarrat. in Epiſt. Pauli ad Ro. c. 1.*

f *To. 1. de moribus Eccl. Cathol. lib. 1. c. 34.*

g *Lib. 2. de imag. cap. 16.*

44 The Papiſts teach, *That Images are Lay-mens books.*

And

And we teach, they are not. Now there is no queſtion but Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion. For hee [h] ſpeaking of ſome who imagined contrary to Scripture, that Saint *Paul* was one of our Sauiour Chriſts beſt beloued Diſciples in his life time: becauſe they had ſeene him and Saint *Peter* pictured with our Sauiour vpon ſome walls: *Sic omnino errare meruerunt, qui Chriſtum & Apoſtolos eius non in ſanctis codicibus, ſed in pictis parietibus quaſierunt:* So they deſerued to erre (ſaith he) who ſought for Chriſt and his Apoſtles vpon painted walls, and not in the Bible.

h *To. 4. de Conſenſ. Euang. lib. 1. Cap. 10.*

45 The [i] Papiſts teach, *That Affrica had her Religion from Rome.* Which we beleeue not. Becauſe [k] Saint *Auſtin* ſaith in expreſſe words, *Ab orientalibus Eccleſijs Euangelium in Africam venit:* The Goſpell came into *Affrica* from the Greeke Church.

i *Baron. Annal. To. 1. ad An. 44. Nu. 39. ND. 3. Conuerſ. part. 1. Cap. 1. Nu. 26.*
k *To. 2. Ep. 170.*

46 The Papiſts teach, *Men may dine on a faſting day:* But ſo doe not we, nor Saint *Auſtin:* for he [l] diſputing about Saturday Faſt, makes a plaine oppoſition betweene dyning & faſting; giuing vs to vnderſtand (which is confeſſed by [m] *Bellarmine*) that he who dynes faſts not, hee who faſts, dynes not.

l *Epiſtola 86. ad Caſulanum.*
m *Lib. 2. de bonis operib. in partic. cap. 2.*

47 The [n] Papiſts teach, *It is a ſinne againſt the firſt Commandement, to diſſwade or hinder any from entring Religion:* that is, according to their Language, *from being a Monke or a Nunne.* But wee thinke not ſo; neither did Saint *Auſtin* thinke ſo: for it is confeſſed by [o] *Claudius Eſpencæus,* that in his 70. Epiſtle, *A Monachiſmi voto Bonifacium reuocauit:* Hee diſſwaded Earle *Boniface* from Monkery, which (queſtionleſſe) he would neuer haue done, if he had beene minded as the Papiſts, That to diſſwade a man from Monkery, had beene a ſinne againſt the firſt Commandement.

n *Vincen. Bruno* in his Treatiſe of Penance, Chap. 10.
o *De continentia, lib. 4. cap. 8. pag. 465.*

48 The [p] Papiſts teach, *A man may liue chaſtly, and yet play the fornicator;* for fornication preiudiceth not the Popiſh vow of Chaſtity: But wee teach the contrary; and ſo did Saint *Auſtin:* for, *Ad caſtitatem pertinet, non fornicari, non machari, nullo illicito concubitu maculari:* He that would liue chaſtly, muſt neither play the Fornicator, nor the Adulterer.

p *Bell. lib. 2. de Monac. cap. 30. & 34.*

Adulterer, nor defile himselfe by any vnlawfull copulation, q saith Saint *Austin*.

q *Tom. 6. lib. de bono coniugali, cap. 22. prope finem.*

49 The Papists teach, *That neither Monkes nor Clergy-men, may liue with their Wiues like married men.* And *iure quo nunc vtimur, Religiosus professus dominij & proprietatis capax non est:* By the Law which now stands in force, no Monke hath right or propriety in goods, r saith *Azorius:* Yet wee teach the contrary; and so did s Saint *Austin*. For, he finds fault with the Heretikes called *Apostolici, Eò quòd in suam communionem non reciperent vtentes coniugibus, & res proprias possidentes, quales habet Ecclesia Catholica & Monachos & Clericos plurimos:* For that they would not receiue into communion with them, such as liued with their wiues like married men, and had propriety in goods: Whereas there were many Monkes and Clergy-men in the Catholicke Church, who liued with their wiues like married men, and had propriety in goods. To which t *Espencaus* knowes not what to say, saue that in many other places Saint *Austin* saith the contrary. And seeing that *vna aut altera hyrundo non facit ver.* One or two Swallowes make not a Summer, there is no reason to beleeue this single testimony, before so many other to the contrary.

r *Instit. Moral. part 1. lib. 12. cap. 6. 4. quæritur.*

s *Tom. 6. de Hær. c. 40.*

t *De Continentia, lib. 5. cap. 8. pag. 648.*

50 The u Papists teach, *That a simple vow*; doubtlesse, *a solemne vow, makes a nullity of Marriage:* and we teach the contrary. And so did Saint *Austin:* for, speaking of that Argument, *Qui dicunt talium nuptias non esse nuptias, sed potius adulteria, non mihi videntur satis acutè & diligenter considerare quid dicunt:* They who say such Marriages are no Marriages, but rather Adulteries, (in my opinion) consider not aduisedly what they say, x saith *Austin:* which testimony is so plaine, that y *Smith*, Reader of Diuinity in Oxford in Queene *Maries* dayes, could shape no better answer to it then this: *viz. Hee would neuer haue taught that the Marriages of Votaries had been true Marriages; but in opposition to Heretickes, of which some condemned second Marriages, some all Marriages.* And z *Muldonat* the Iesuite was forced to confesse (without pretending any such excuse as that of *Smithes*) that Saint *Aust* was flat of con-

u *Gloss. in c. Quod vouentes. c. 27. q. 1. apud Grat. Bell. lib. 1. de Matrimon. c. 21.*

x *To. 4. de bona viduitatis, cap. 10.*

y *De vatis Monasticis.*

z *To. 2. disput. de Matrimon. part. 3. q. 2. de 3. impedimento. id est, voto.*

contrary opinion to them in this; for, disputing the question, *An votum solenne castitatis dirimat Matrimonium, quòd postea contrahitur?* having alleadged diuers Fathers (amongst whom Saint *Austin* was one) and Councels for the negatiue: comming to answer, *Quod attinet ad Argumentum ex testimonijs veterum Authorum; Non videtur mihi esse negandum, multos illorum in ea fuisse sententia vt existimarent, per votum solenne non dirimi Matrimonium. Nam August: non tantùm aperte dicit, sed etiam contendit, &c.* To the Argument (saith hee) taken from the testimonies of the ancient Writers, my answer is; That in my opinion, many of them thought, a solemne vow did not make a nullity of Marriage: for *Austin* doth not onely say so much in plaine terms, but he confidently auows it for a certain truth, &c.

51 The [a] Papists generally teach, That *Lymbus puerorum* is a part of Hell, wherin Children are punished, *pœnâ solius damni æternâ:* distinct frō that part of Hel, wherin the Diuell & his Angels are punished *pœna damni & sensus æterna.* But we say this doctrine of theirs is not true. After this life there is no place for any, but either in Heauen with Christ, or in Hell with the Diuel. And of this mind was S. *Austin*; for, *nec est vllus vlli medius locus, vt possit esse, nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo:* There is no third place left for any, but hee must needs bee with the Diuell, who is not with Christ [b] saith he: Wherin he is so constant, that [c] Cardinall *Cotarenus* speaking hereof, *Hunc locum Augustinus in multis suorum operum locis non videtur agnoscere:* S. *Austin*, saith hee, in many of his Tomes, seemes not to acknowledge any such place as *Lymbus puerorum.*

52 The [d] Papists teach, that *Lymbus patrum*, otherwise called *Abrahams bosome*, is a part of Hell, wherin the holy Fathers, who dyed before Christs passion, were punished *pœnâ solius damni temporali*: which doctrine we dislike. And so did Saint *Austin:* For, considering hee read in Scripture, that there was a great Gulfe betweene the rich man in Hell, and *Lazarus* in *Abrahams* bosome, and hee could neuer finde that the name of Hell was vsed in good part, in any part of Scripture; hee [e] concluded, that *Abrahams*

a *Bell. lib. 2. de purgat. cap. 6.*

b *Tom. 7. de peccat. Merit. & Remiss. lib. 1. cap. 28. See de verb. Apostoli Ser. 4. & lib. 5. Hypognostic.*

c *de Sacrament. lib. 3. cap. 1.*

d *Bell. lib. 2. de Purgat. cap. 6.*

e *Epistola 57. & 99. & de Gen. ad litteram, lib.*

hams boſome, which is the ſame with that which Papiſts call *Lymbus patrum*, was (queſtionleſſe) no part of Hell, for which hee is reproued by [f] *Lorinus* a Ieſuite.

f *Comment. in Act.* 2. 24.

53 The [g] Papiſts ſay, that it was *Samuel* himſelfe who appeared to *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* 28. and not ſome euill ſpirit which tooke his ſimilitude. But we ſay the contrary: And that Saint *Auſtin* was of our opinion heerein, it is confeſſed by [h] *Bodin*, who diſcourſing vpon this poynt, acknowledgeth, *Auſtin* was one of them who held *hunc fuiſſe Diabolum*, that hee who appeared to *Saul*, was the Deuill. And as much is acknowledged by [i] *Marianus Victorius*, in theſe wordes, *Hier. Tom.* 4. *Falſum eſſe ſcribit, Samuelem à pythoniſſa illa muliere ſuſcitatum, cùm potiùs viſa fuerit id feciſſe quàm fecerit: quod etiam Auguſtinus latiùs probat.* Saint *Ierome* in his fourth Tome writes, It is falſe, that *Samuel* was raiſed by the Pythoneſſe; for ſhe rather ſeemed to raiſe him, then indeed raiſed him. Which truth is proued more at large by *Auſtin*. And *Auguſtinum magis inclinare in eam partem, vt credatur non verè ſpiritum Samuelis à ſua requie excitatum fuiſſe, ſed aliquod phãtaſma, &c.* That Saint *Auſtin* enclined rather to thinke it was not indeed *Samuel*, but ſome Hob-goblin that was raiſed, it is confeſſed [k] by *Ianſenius*.

g *Damiſis. Annot. in* 1 *Sam.* 28.

h *Dæmonomaniæ lib.* 2. *c.* 3.

i *In Indice Rerum & verborum operum Hieron. ad finem, To.* 9. *verbo Necromantia.*

54 The [l] Papiſts teach, That the *Rocke*, whereon our Sauiour promiſed to build his Church, was Saint *Peter*. But wee ſay, it was Chriſt himſelfe, and not Saint *Peter*. Now, that Saint *Auſtin* is heerein of our opinion, it is plaine by his owne wordes: for thus he [m], writes, *Tu es Petrus, & ſuper hanc Petram quam confeſſus es, ſuper hanc Petram quam cognouiſti (dicens Tu es Chriſtus, Filius Dei viui) ædificabo Eccleſiam meam. i. Super meipſum, Filium Dei viui ædificabo Eccleſiam meam, ſuper me ædificabo te, non me ſuper te, &c.* Thou art *Peter*, and vpon this Rocke which thou haſt confeſſed, vpon this Rocke which thou haſt knowne (ſaying, Thou art Chriſt, the Sonne of the liuing God) will I build my Church: that is, vpon my ſelfe the Sonne of the liuing God, will I build my Church, I will build thee vpon me, not me vpon thee, &c.

k *Comment. in Eccl. cap.* 46.

l *Bell. lib.* 1. *de Rom. Pont. cap.* 10.

m *De verbis Domini. ſer.* 13.

thee &c. Which words sound so fully, that our q Rhemists best answer is, Saint *Austin examined not the nature of the originall words which Christ spake, nor of the Greeke.* r Bellarmines best answer is, *Ex ignorantia linguæ Hebræa deceptum: Austin* was deceiued for want of knowledge in the Hebrew. s Pighius censure of *Austin* is, *Nusquam hæret, nusquam figit pedem, sed vbique explorat, vbiq; tentat, subordinatur omnia: & quicquid probabile occurrit, alicubi amplectitur, quod continuò post displicet, & retractatur:* He can neuer resolue certainly vpon any thing, but fetcheth about this way & that way, and after that, a third way: and at length lighting vpon some probability, hee layeth hold on that, yet dislikes it presently, and retracts it. Affirming further, that Saint *Austin* neuer expounded these wordes so, but * when hee was idle-headed and giuen to crotchets. Concluding, it was *Contorta expositio, atq; adeo ipsis verbis Christi manifestè aduersaria:* A forced exposition, and quite contrary to Christs words.

q *Annot. in Mat.* 16.18.

r *Lib. 1. de Rom. Pont. cap. 10.*

s *Hierarch. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 5.*

* *Otiosè secum inquirens, & tentantis omnia.*

t *Pigh. Hierarch. Eccl. lib. 3. cap. 9.*

55 The t Papists teach, That the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heauen were giuen to *Peter* onely. But wee say, That *Peter* represented the person of the Church, when Christ said vnto him, *To thee will I giue the keyes of the Kingdome of Heauen.* And so saith u Saint *Austin.* For, *Petrus quando claues accepit, Ecclesiam sanctam significauit:* When *Peter* receiued the keyes, hee represented the Church, saith Saint *Austin.* Which speech so gawles the Papists, that thereupon x *Pighius* breakes out into these words; *De Augustino possem dicere, quod vnus homo fuerit, hac in re nec secum firmiter, nec cum alijs consentiens. At patrum sententia tunc apud nos est præcipua authoritas, quando & secum, & cum alijs consentientes, ipsam nobis explicant communem Orthodoxæ Ecclesiæ sententiam:* I may truely say of *Austin*, that hee is the onely man, who in this point neither agreeth constantly with himselfe nor with others. Now we giue credit to the Fathers, when agreeing with themselues, and with other of their fellowes, they deliuer vnto vs the common opinion of the Orthodoxall Church.

u *Tract. 50. in Ioh.*

x *Hierarch. Eccl. lib. 6 cap. 4. fol. 286.*

56 The [y] Papists say, That the young man who told our Sauiour, *Mat.* 19. 20. that he had kept all the commandements of God, spake *truly*: but wee say, hee spake *vntruly*: And so did Saint *Austin*: For, *Puto, quòd se arrogantiùs, quàm verius seruasse responderat*: I thinke hee spake more proudly then truly, [z] saith Saint *Austin*; which is confessed to be Saint *Austins* opinion by [a] *Maldonat.*

57 The [b] Papists teach, That the words of Christ, *Mat.* 26. 29. *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, &c.* are not to be vnderstood of the *Sacramentall cup*, but of the *Paschall*. We say the contrary. Now Saint *Austin* is so fully of our opinion, that [c] *Bellarmine* turnes him off with this answer, *Dico Augustum non expendisse hunc locum diligenter, vt ex eo patet, quòd breuissimè se expedinit ab hac difficultate*: *Austin* did not well consider of this Text, which appeares by this, that he passed it ouer briefly.

58 The [d] Papists teach, That the words, *Iohn* 10. 16. *There shall be one flocke and one Shepheard*, are not meant of *Christ*, but of the *Pope*. But we teach the contrary. And so did Saint *Austin*, *Tract.* 47. *in Ioh.* and *Ser.* 49. *de verbis Domini*.

59 Some [e] Papists hold opinion, That in the Controuersie betweene Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul*, mentioned, *Gal.* 2. Saint *Peter* did not *minimum delinquere*, sin so much as venially: others [f] hold, *perhaps hee sinned venially*. But wee say hee sinned grieuously, and so did Saint *Austin*. For, in him we read, that Saint *Peter* [g] *Contra regulam veritatis cogebat gentes Iudaizare*: compelled the Gentiles against the rule of faith, to play the Iewes. Saint *Peter*, *in simulationem superstitiosam*, yea [h] *in prauam simulationem lapsus est*; fell into superstitious and wicked dissimulation. With which speeches of his, [i] *Baronius* is so much offended, that he sticks not to say, Saint *Austin* did therein, *A linea Catholica fidei aberrare, & in lapidem offensionis incurrere*; Swerue from the Catholicke faith, and stumble vpon the stone of offence.

60 The [k] Papists teach, That *Iacob* adored the top of his sonne *Iosephs* Rod, *Heb.* 11. 21. But we say, *Iacob* worshipped

y *Bell. lib. 2. de Monach. c. 9. Maldonat. com. in Mat.* 19. 20.
z *Epist. 89 q. 4.*
a *Loco proximè citato.*
b *Bel. lib. 1. de Euch c. 11. Maldonat. in Mat.* 26. 29.
c *Ibid.*
d *Ioh. de Parisijs de potestate Regia & papali, ca. 3. Stapleton Antidot. in Euang. Ioh. 10.*
e *Bar. Annal. To. 1. ad An. 51. Nu.* 31.
f *Bel. lib. 1. de Ro. Pont.*
g *Lib. 2. de Bapt. cont. Donat. ca. 1.*
h *De agone Christiano. cap. 30.*
i *Loco supra citato.*
k *Rhem. annot. in Heb.* 11. 21.

shipped not *Iosephs* Rod; but that leaning vpon his owne Rod by reason of his weakneſſe, hee adored God. Now that Saint *Auſtin* ſo expounds the place, our [l] Rhemiſts are forced to confeſſe.

[l] *Loco citato.*

[m] *Rhem. Annot. in Heb. 13. 16.*

61 The [m] Papiſts ſay, That the words, *Heb. 13. 16.* ſhould be tranſlated, *God is promerited:* we ſay, *God is well pleaſed.* Now that Saint *Auſtin* is on our ſide, it is witneſſed by [n] *Viues*; for in his Notes vpon *Auſtin de Ciuitate Dei*, where the words, *Heb. 13. 16* are thus cited, *placatur Deus*, God is pacified. *In antiquis, placetur Deo, vtrumque melius quàm quo modo vulgò habemus, promeretur Deus:* In the ancient Copies (ſaith hee) wee read, God is pleaſed, both readings being better then the common reading, God is promerited.

[n] *Lib. 10. c. 5.*

[o] *Allen. de Euch. ſacrificio, cap. 5.*

62 The [o] Papiſts teach, That by the *Incenſe* mentioned *Mal. 1. 7.* is meant their *Sacriſice of the Maſſe:* But wee ſay, thereby is meant *the prayers and praiſes of the Saints.* And [p] Saint *Auſtin* agreeth ſo fully with vs heerein, that [q] *Azorius* beſt anſwer is, *Auguſt: Reliquem veterum patrum cœtum opponimus, & Synodi Tridentinæ teſtimonium:* Wee oppoſe againſt Saint *Auſtin* the generall conſent of other Fathers, and the teſtimony of the Councell of *Trent.*

[p] *Lib. 2. cont. Ep. Petiliani, cap. 89*

[q] *Inſtit. moral. part. 1. lib. 10. cap. 11. 7. queritur.*

FINIS.

SAINT AVSTINS SVMMES:

OR,

THE SVMME OF SAINT AVSTINS RELIGION:

Collected Verbatim from his owne vndoubted *Writings*, wherein the *Reader* may plainely and euidently see this Conclusion proued, *that* S. AVSTIN (*who liued neere Twelue Hundred* Yeeres before the time of LVTHER) agreed with the *Church* of ENGLAND, in all the maine Poynts of *Faith* and DOCTRINE.

In Answer to Mr. IOHN BREERELEY, *Priest.*

By WILLIAM CROMPTON, *Mr.* of *Arts*, of *Brazen-nose* Colledge in *Oxford*, and *Preacher* of the Word of GOD, at *Little-Kymbell* in *Buckingham-shire.*

Let vs examine your Doctrine by the Writings of the Fathers: if it consent with them, let it be retained, if it dissent, let it be reiected; Theodos. apud Zozamen. Lib. 7.

LONDON.
Printed for *Iohn Marriot*, and are to be sold at his Shop in St. *Dunstane's* Churchyard in *Fleet-street*. 1625.

(18) 206 (3) p.

Dexter 547.

TO

THE HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE,

GEORGE, Duke of *Buckingham*,

Lord *High Admirall*, Viſcount VILLERS,
Baron of *Waddon*, Maſter of his *Maieſties* Horſe,
Knight of the moſt Noble Order of the *Garter*,
Gentleman of his *Highnes* Bed-chamber,
and one of his *Maieſties* moſt Honorable
Priuie Councell.

IT is vigilancie in Ciuill Affaires (*moſt Noble Lord*) which hath euer beene truely eſteemed a chiefe part of Policie, to detect the Conſpiracies of vndermining Traytors, and ſo to preſerue his Perſon that ſwayes the Scepter of the Land: Neither can it bee leſſe in matters *Eccleſiaſticall*; to preuent Heretickes, extirpate Hereſie, and ſo to preſerue his *Honour* that ſwayes the Scepter of the *World*. And now is the time or neuer, that Satan by Ieſuiticall Stratagems, and Ieſuites by Satanicall deluſions, are both vigilantly laborious to eclipſe the bright ſplendor of *our Morning Starre*, preparing darke ignorance to ſup-

ply the roome of our *glorious Sunne*, breathing after nothing more, then to ſtrangle the pleaſant voyce of our *ſweetly-ſinging Turtle*, and ſo to leaue vs in the penſiue ſhadow of a liuing death: It cannot then chooſe but be a great part of *ſacred Policie* in all true Chriſtian Catholiques (eſpecially in the Watchmen of Iſrael, to oppoſe to their ſubtilty a laborious vigilancie; that ſo the ancient Truth may bee freed from all infectious Noueltie. Now, becauſe no Policie can ſtand long, which is not vnderprop'd with *Piety*, nor any Piety commendable, which wants *Antiquity*; I haue vndertaken to proue and publiſh this Aſſertion: *That the preſent Religion of the Church of England, is the ſame which was taught by the Fathers of the Primitiue Church; eſpecially by S. Auſtin*, whoſe Religion, (as Mr. *Brereley* grants) was vndoubtedly the Religion of all the other Fathers. And it was your conſtant *Reſolution* (moſt Honorable Lord) *ſeconded by Practice*, in a forreigne Nation, where it was moſt dangerous, that as you euer had beene, ſo you would continue to bee *a Defender & Profeſſor of the truly-ancient Catholike Faith*; which firſt gaue encouragement to a ſolitary Country Muſe, to preſent it ſelfe to the view of *your Grace*: To whom I know it is not vnknowne, that all pleaſures and Dignities that can be beſtowed on Mortality, are but Emblemes of infelicity to thoſe that walke not in the true Religion; or if you pleaſe to take it in ſhorter Characters; *It is but gilded miſery, to bee eminent and irreligious*; and tis as good to bee of none, as not to be of the true Religion. If you aske, *Which is the true?* I anſwer, Without all controuerſie,

ſie, that is the true *Religion*, which was taught by *Chriſt*, his *Apoſtles*, and the *Fathers* of the *Primitiue Church*: But the preſent Religion profeſt in the Church of England, was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles (as an *Arch-fiſher in the Pooles of Babylon* did lately in a manner acknowledge) and by the Fathers of the Primitiue Church, for the firſt 400. yeeres after Chriſt, eſpecially by Saint *Auſtin*, (as his inſuing *Summes* doe demonſtrate) and therefore this is the truly-old Religion; In which if you walke on (Right Noble Lord) as you haue well begun, you ſhall attaine to the height of *Honour*, to that firſt deſired, and laſt obtained *felicity*, euen an euerlaſting Diadem of Glory.

Saint *Auſtin* tels vs, *Non quærenda eſt Religio (vera) in confuſione Paganorum, neque in purgamentis Hæreticorum, neq; in languore Sciſmaticorum, neque in cæcitate Iudæorum; ſed apud eos ſolos, qui Chriſtiani Catholici nominantur:* The true Religion is to bee found onely amongſt them which are called Chriſtian-Catholikes, and therefore (in Saint *Auſtins* Iudgement) not amongſt them which are now called *Roman-Catholikes*, which ſtile or title they challenge, onely to diſtinguiſh themſelues from Saint *Auſtines* Chriſtian-Catholiques, and their Religion from the Chriſtian-Catholike Religion, profeſſed and maintained in the dayes of Saint *Auſtin*. *De vera Relig. Cap. 5.*

This little Worke (yet profitable, I hope, againſt all thoſe which abuſe Antiquity) I begun and finiſht at the requeſt of one of my *deareſt Friends*, onely for a priuate Exerciſe, to try the ſpirits of thoſe men, which bragge ſo much of *Antiquity*: And being

now preſt to the view of the World, I could not find to whom I might more fitly dedicate the ſame, *then to your Grace.* Firſt, becauſe you are knowne to be both able and willing to honour him, who hath honoured you with the Princely fauour of one of the greateſt *Monarks* in the World. Now you can *honour God* in nothing more, then in labouring to defend and countenance *the true Religion*, eſpecially in theſe dangerous and backſliding dayes; and who knowes, whether hee hath not called you to this Honour for ſuch a time as this? to inuite and intreat your *Superiours*, to inſtruct and direct your *Equals*, to compell and conſtraine your *Inferiours* to come and taſte of this Banquet (*delicioſo ſaginari pabulo*, as *Gregory* ſpeaks of Saint *Auſtines* Workes) to beleeue and maintaine the truely ancient Catholike Faith, taught twelue hundred yeeres agoe by Saint *Auſtin*, and now maintained by the *Church of England?* It is the thing, I know, you chiefly intend; my words ſerue onely to *commend and confirme* your good intention; for it is iuſtly ſuppoſed that you were called by God to this Eminencie, that you might helpe to *ouerthrow Idolatry*, to ſtop the procreation of *Hereſie*, and to oppoſe all *Antichriſtian Tyranny*. You haue already giuen a worthy onſet euen to the face of the Enemie (to the great contentment of all *true Engliſh Hearts.*) Goe on (Noble Lord) in this good Action, and GOD will crowne you in the end of the Day.

Secondly, becauſe *your Name* and Patronage might procure it a freer entrance to his *Maieſtie*, to whoſe preſence (if it bee not preſt to death in the way)

way) it hath vowed to come; and by your fauourable aſſiſtance to preferre a Petition in the Defence of Saint *Auſtin*, againſt one *Iohn Brereley a Romiſh Prieſt*, who hath lately caſt a falſe imputation vpon him, in coyning him a new Religion, (which liuing, hee neuer taught) ſo making him the Author of Hereſie, and dedicating all to the *Kings moſt Sacred Maieſtie*.

Thirdly, becauſe *your Honorable and Gracious* acceptance of it, will make the acceptation generall, by freeing it from the preiudice of contempt, and bee a ſufficient Protection for the Author againſt all the fiery Darts of repining Enuy: Let then *your Gracious* fauour be as the Sunne, ſhining on this withered *Antiquity*; that the *Motto* may ſpeake as long as Time endures;

Buckinghamiæ radiis rediuiuus
vireſcit AVGVSTINVS.

Which plaine-ſpeaking Work, if you pleaſe to countenance, I'le write your Name hereafter in a higher ſtraine. Accept then (moſt Honourable Lord) theſe weake endeuours of an Infant Muſe, who neuertheleſſe (were ſhe ſwaddled in the gentle bands of your Graces affection) dares, by Gods help, to encounter with a ſtronger *Philiſtine*.

And I beſeech the *Lord of Lords* to bleſſe and proſper all your endeuours, tending to the ad-

uancement of *Gods glory*, the *ſupplanting* of his *Maieſties Enemies*, and the maintaining of the *truely-ancient-Catholicke Religion*, that ſo, when you haue ſerued out your Generation heere, you may bee freely admitted in the fauour of the *King of Kings*; which is the dayly deſire of

From my Study at little *Kimbell* in *Buckinghamſhire* this 13. of *October*. 1624.

Your moſt humbly deuoted Seruant,

WILLIAM CROMPTON.

THE

THE AVTHORS PREFACE.

A Christian-Catholike, to all Roman-Catholikes, wishes Reformation and Saluation.

MY intent is to perswade you (and did not I hope to preuaile, I would ne're salute you) that you would acknowledge to the World, what I know you beleeue, that Saint Austin *in the chiefest poynts of Religion is* your greatest Aduersarie; *and that you neuer read a more sound, plaine and direct Confutation of your Religion, then in the Workes of Saint* Austin: *Neither need you bee ashamed of this Confession; most of your learned Clerks haue done it already. Concerning that speech of Christ,*

Super hanc Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam:

Vpon this Rocke will I build my Church, *Math.*16.18.

most of the ancient Fathers haue interpreted it, as the Church of Rome doth; onely one Austin *is to be excepted, saith*

Nam nimis peruersè seipsum amat, qui & alios vult errare, vt error suus lateat. Aug. Epist. 7. Marcel.

Dum erubescis corrigere errorem non erubescis permanere in errore, quod erubescendum fuit. Aug. Epi. 48. Vincent.

Tom. 3. de ob. fidei. q. 5. sect. 28. Lib. 1. de Rom. Pont. c. 10. Pig. lib. 3. Hier. Eccles. c. 5. Mald. Comment. in Math. Staplet. relect. prin. fid. doct. cont. 3. q. 7. Cont. lib. 3. de Sac. c. 1. Bar. Tom. 1. numb. 31.

saith Greg. de Valent. *Saint* Austin *was deceiued for want of knowledge in the Hebrew Tongue, saith* Bellarmine. *That Exposition of S.* Austin *is contrary to the words of Christ, saith that great Censurer* Pighius. Maldonat *leaues Saint* Austin, *and sticks to a surer card, the Councell of* Trent. *Saint* Austin *is accused of grosse ignorance by* Stapleton. *Saint* Austin *doth not acknowledge any* Limbus puerorum, *saith* Contarenus. *He did erre from the Catholike faith in censuring Saint* Peter, *saith that Historie-maker* Baronius. *And in many other matters, (of which you and your distructers cannot bee ignorant) is Saint* Austin *most sharply reproued, especially by* Pighius *and* Bellarmine, *who make no more account of Fathers opposing their Tridentine tenents, then Plough-men doe of thornes and bryers that annoy them.*

Alphons. aduers. Hæres.

In so much that Alphonsus *sayes, that he will beleeue* Anacletus *before Saint* Austin. *Thus you see that your greatest Diuines do reiect Saint* Austin, *as not daring to let him be Iudge of the matter in controuersie; Whether the Christian Catholike, or the Roman Catholike Religion bee of greater Antiquity? Hee is too open an Aduersary, a knowne Protestant-like Nouellist of some* 1200. *yeeres standing. But seeing you haue appealed to Saint* Austin, *to Saint* Austin *you shall goe; if hee beare any sway in your affections, (little can the word of man preuaile, where Gods Word is reiected) either conforme your selues to that Religion which he sayes is the true Religion, or else confesse that your Religion was vnknowne to Saint* Austin, *and that your Roman Catholikes were vnbaptized in his dayes. As for this Worke of Mr.* Brereleyes, *which hath beene perused (to my knowledge) by diuers learned Papists; who cannot choose but take it ill, to see them*

In Comitat. Lancastr. μοναχικοῦ. Papistarum, καθολικῶς.

themſelues ſo groſſly abuſed: you may very well excuſe it, and ſay that Mr. Brereley *was in an error, and dealt vnaduiſedly, only through perſwaſion of a priuate friend, without any direction from the Church, to put the matters in controuerſie to Saint* Auſtins *iudgement, who left life before your Religion had any.*

Whereas Mr. Brereley *hath alleadged certaine confeſſions of ſome both* Engliſh and German *Diuines, to the contrary, you ſee, I might haue paid him home in his owne coyne, ſeeing moſt Papiſts in ſome part of their Workes doe either condemne, or moſt ſimply reiect Saint* Auſtin: *But as I haue not anſwered the one; no more haue I obiected the other, being counſeld to both by Saint* Auſtin *himſelfe, who would haue vs to beleeue himſelfe of himſelfe rather then any other what-euer.* De me mihi magis quàm vlli alteri credas, ſi mihi dilectionis vicem rependis: *If you loue Saint* Auſtin, *you muſt beleeue him of himſelfe, rather then any other ſpeaking either for him or againſt him; and therefore I haue left their words & Works to anſwer for themſelues, who haue ouer-harſhly and many times vndeſeruedly cenſured this Father, & haue only peruſed his owne Works, from whence I haue drawne the* Summe of his Religion, *into certaine Concluſions, which heere I offer to your moſt retyred conſideration, hoping that when you haue read them, you will neuer hereafter ſo falſly ſlander our Church, as to ſay,* That the Religion thereof was neuer extant before the dayes of *Luther; The blindeſt ſort of the Laity (whoſe Books are Images, and beſt knowledge, ignorance) do begin to ſee that this is ouer-groſſe impudencie; and that our Religion is ancient indeede, taught by Chriſt, his Apoſtles, and Fathers of the Primitiue Church; but your Religion*

Tom. 2. Epiſt. 3. Voluſ.

is a more glittering Religion, pleasant to the eye of flesh & fleshly men, as the forbidden Apple was to the eye of Eue; *the factious part wherof whosoeuer beleeues fully and finally, dyes eternally.*

From hence it will euidently appeare vnto you, what hurt Torrensis *and* Brereley *haue done to your Religion, in appealing to S.* Austin; *for, if he be Iudge, your Religion cannot stand.* 1. *S.* Austin *sayes, that all things necessary to saluation, are contained plainly in Scripture,* [a] *which you deny; confessing plainely, that your Religion cannot be maintained by the written Word of God.* 2. *S.* Austin *teaches, that all men should read the Scriptures, as well the vnlearned as the learned,* [b] *which you cannot endure, lest the bright beames of Gods glorious Gospell should disperse the clowds of ignorance from the eyes of their vnderstandings, that so they might see your words fighting against Gods Word.* 3. *That if there be question made, which is the true Church, it must be decided only by Scripture,* [c] *which you will not consent vnto.* 4. *That generall Councels may erre,* [d] *which you deny.* 5. *That* Christ *gaue no* Supremacy *to* Peter, *more then to the rest of his* Apostles; [e] *but you teach the contrary.* 6. *That himselfe & the Laity at* Hyppo *made* Eradius *Bishop* [f]; *yet you say none can doe it but the Pope.* 7. *S.* Austin *teaches, That it is necessary for Monks to labour with their hands* [g]; *but you say it is not.* 8. *That the* King *hath supreme authority ouer all persons in his Kingdome, euen in matters which concerne Religion* [h]; *which you deny.* 9. *That we should not set vp Images in Churches, nor worship them* [i]; *but you teach and practise both.* 10. *That it is better to go to plough, then to dance on the Sabbath day;* [k] *but you dispence with all lasciuious sports; so they work*

a *De doct. Christ. lib. 2. c. 9.*

b *Epist. 3. ad Volus.*

c *Lib. de vnit. Eccles. c. 2. & 26. Epist. etiam 48.*

d *Lib. 2. de Baptis. cont. Don. c. 2. & 3.*

e *Expos. in Euang. Ioh. Tract. 124.*

f *Epist. 110.*

g *Lib. de oper. Mon. c. 17.*

h *Epist. 50. Bonif.*

i *Enar. in Psal. 113.*

k *Enar. in Psal. 32.*

work not on Feſtiuals. 11. *S.* Auſtin *ſaies, That Miracles are not now neceſſary, to confirme the true Religion* [l] *but you teach the contrary.* 12. *S.* Auſtin *ſayes, That the naturall body of Chriſt wherin he roſe from death, can be but in one place at one time* [m]; *which ouerthrowes Tranſubſtantiation; but you ſay, it may bee in diuers places at one and the ſame time. Thus could I eaſily go ouer all, or moſt of the points of your Religion, and ſtill conclude, that it is contrary to S.* Auſtins *Religion: But leſt I ſhould be thought to make a Book of a Preface, I'le only refer you to thoſe ſeuerall Queſtions, which are briefly handled in this enſuing Treatiſe; beſeeching the Lord, that he would giue you vnderſtanding hearts, that ſo you may read, know and beleeue the truly-ancient Catholike Religion, which was taught by S.* Auſtin; *beleeue what you read him ſpeaking, and publiquely profeſſe what you beleeue, or elſe call S.* Auſtin *an Hereticke, and ſay, as a learned Ieſuit doth,* (Mald. conuent. in Ioh.) *that if S.* Auſtin *had liued in theſe daies, perhaps he would haue beene of your opinion & Religion, who liuing ſo long before your Religion came into the world, could not teach and maintaine what you do at this day: but if you will needs perſeuere in your own opinions againſt your knowledge, againſt S.* Auſtin, *and all Antiquity; ſtudy to defend them from the writings of ſome other; as of* Eccius, Pighius, Contarenns, Hoſius, Lindanus, Pinellus, Greg. de Val. Bellarmine, Baronius, *or of Father* Parſons, *and neuer more ſlander the ſoule of this departed Saint, who was vndoubtedly as great an Aduerſary to the Articles of your Religion, concluded in the late Councell of* Trent, *as euer he was to* Arrianiſme, Manichiſme, Donatiſme *or* Pelagianiſme: *for my owne part, I haue vſed no bitter nor rayling*

[l] Lib. 22. de Ciuit. Dei. c. 8.

[m] Tract. 30. in Ioh.

Tenete mecum ſancti viri Auguſt. ſententiam, non ſolùm eius authoritate, ſed ipſa veritate firmatum, Ep. 112.

Quicunque in vobis ſunt ſcientes quid verum ſit, & pro animoſitate ſuæ peruerſitatis contra veritatem ſibi notiſſimam dimicantes, horum impietas Idololatriam ſuperat. Auguſt. Epiſt. 48.

Aug. Tom. 6. lib. pont. Epiſt. fundam. c. 2.

ling ſpeeches againſt you in my Anſwere. Illi in vos ſeruiant, qui neſciunt cum quo labore verum inueniatur, & quàm difficile caueantur errores: *If either Mr.* Brereley *or any other ſhall vndertake to proue me erroneous either in matter or manner; let him doe it like a Scholler, ſoundly, without vaine circumſtances; like a Chriſtian, charitably, auoyding perſonall calumnies, and then ſpare me not; but I hope, your vnderſtandings will be conuinſt, and your Pens ſilenſt with this plaine poſitiue doctrine; that ſo Truth in a demonſtration may once take a view of the World without oppoſition.*

Auguſt. cont. Petil. lib. 3. c. 59.

To conclude; I may well vſe thoſe words of S. Auſtin *to the* Donatiſts: Si ſapitis benè & rectè, &c. *If you will be wiſe & vnderſtand the Truth, 'tis well: if otherwiſe, it ſhall not grieue me that I haue taken this paines for you; for though your hearts returne not to the peace of the Church; yet my peace ſhall returne to mee in the Church: who for all this remaine to be.*

Kymb: 13. Octob:
An. Dom. 1624.

Yours, if you be Chriſts,

WILLIAM CROMPTON.

A Caueat for the Reader.

FOr thy ſatisfaction and further direction; know (iudicious Reader) that I peruſed the ſame Volumes of S. *Auſtins* Works, in the ſame Edition which Mr. *Brereley* did, Printed at *Baſil, Anno Domini* 1569. They are 10. Tomes in Folio. *(Froben)*

T. HB.

THE TABLE OF
S. AVSTINS *Summes.*

Queſt. *Fol.*

1 WHether was Saint *Auſtin* ſuch a Monke as thoſe which are at this day allowed by the Church of *Rome?* 1.

2 Whether doth Saint *Auſtin* teach, that the Sonne of God is God of God, and not of himſelfe? 5.

3 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that God is no Author of ſinne, and that hee did reprobate ſome to damnation? 9.

4 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that God did command any thing in it owne nature impoſſible to be done? 14.

5 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that Chriſt ſuffered according to his Deity? 17.

6 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that Chriſt is our Mediator only according to his humane nature? 19.

7 Whether doth Saint *Auſtin* teach, that Chriſt from his Natiuity was free from all kind of ignorance, according to his Humanity? 21.

8 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that Chriſt deſcended into Hell? 23.

9 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that the naturall body of Chriſt can be vpon earth without circumſcription? 24.

10 Whether doth Saint *Auſtin* teach, that the bleſſed Virgin *Mary* was conceiued without originall ſinne? 28.

11 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that the body of the bleſſed Virgin was aſſumed into Heauen? 30.

12 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that the bleſſed Virgin was tyed so perpetuall Chaſtity by a ſolemne vow? 32.

13 Whether doth Saint *Auſtin* teach, that there are diuers degrees and orders of Angels? 34.

14 Whether doth S. *Auſtin* teach, that the holy Scriptures are to be

acknowledged for such, onely by the authority of the Church? 38.
15 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that the Bookes of *Tobie*, *Iudith* and *Machabees*, &c. are Canonicall Scriptures? 41.
16 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that one Text of Scripture may haue diuers true senses? 45.
17 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that the Traditions of the Church ought to be receiued? 47.
18 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that all Heretickes doe rely or insist only on the Scripture? 50.
19 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that the Church of *Christ* is free from error? 53.
20 Whether doth Saint *Austin* teach, that the Church of *Christ* is Catholike? 56.
21 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that the militant Church must euer continue, and that visibly? 59.
22 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that the Church was built vpon the person of S. *Peter*? 61.
23 Whether doth S. *Austin* giue any Primacie of power or Dominion to the Roman Church? 66.
24 Whether doth Saint *Austin* deny Ecclesiasticall Supremacie to Emperours and Kings? 68.
25 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that the Sacraments doe conferre Grace, *ex opere operato*? 73.
26 Whether doth S. *Austin* teach, that certain Sacraments do imprint a Character, or any materiall marke in the Soule of the Receiuer? 77.
27 Whether doth Saint *Austin* teach, that there are seuen Sacraments? 78.
28 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach, that the Sacraments are to bee administred with the signe of the Crosse? 81.
29 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach, that Baptisme takes away all sins both Originall and Actuall? 85.
30 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach, that Concupiscence remaining after Baptisme, be a sinne? 86.
31 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach, that Children dying without Baptisme, cannot be saued? 89.
32 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach all or most of the ceremonies of Baptisme now vsed in the Roman Church? 94.
33 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach the vse of Confirmation? 98.
34 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach, the reall-corporall presence of Christs body and bloud is in the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*? 101.
35 Whether dotth S: *Austin* teach, that the very wicked doe truly receiue the naturall body of Christ? 107.
36 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach, that the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* ought to be receiued fasting? 110.

37 Whe-

37 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* ought to be adored? 113.
38 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that the *Euchariſt* is a true and proper Sacrifice? 116.
39 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* is propiciatory for the dead? 119.
40 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that this Sacrament was offered vpon Altars? 121.
41 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach the neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion to Prieſts? 123.
42 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach the vſe of extreme vnction, as now it is vſed in the Church of *Rome*? 128.
43 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that Ordination is properly a Sacrament? 132.
44 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that there ought to bee a ſuperiority amongſt the Clergie? 133.
45 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that Prieſts may not marry? 133.
46 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that Matrimony is a Sacrament of the new Teſtament? 138.
47 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that in caſe of Diuorce vpon Adultery, the inocent party may not marry another? 140.
48 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that man hath free-will now to doe good of himſelfe? 141.
49 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, wee are iuſtified by good workes before God? 147.
50 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that true iuſtifying faith once had, may be loſt? 150.
51 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that our good works can merit before God? 152.
52 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that a man may doe more then he is commanded by God? 155.
53 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that mortall and veniall ſinnes do differ of their owne natures? 157.
54 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach it lawfull to pray for the dead, as it is now practiſed in the Church of *Rome*? 161.
55 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that there is a place of Purgatory after this life? 164.
56 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, and proue a locall Hell and materiall fire therein? 167.
57 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that Saints ought to bee inuocated? 170.
58 Whether doth *Saint Auſtin* teach, that Saints may be worſhipped? 172.
59 Whether doth S: *Auſtin* teach, that the Reliques of the Saints are

are to bee reuerenced, as they are at this day in the Church of *Rome?* 175

60 Whether doth *S: Austin* teach, that it is lawfull to vse the Images of Christ and of his Saints, in matters of Religion? 177.

61 Whether doth *S: Austin* hold it lawfull to worship the Images of Christ and his Saints? 180.

62 Whether doth *S: Austin* teach, that it is lawfull to prescribe daies of fasting? 183.

63 Whether doth S: *Austin* teach it to be a true Fast, when men abstaine from Flesh only? 186.

64 Whether doth *S: Austin* hold it lawfull to vow Chastity? 188.

65 Whether doth *Saint Austin* hold it lawfull to vow a Religious life? 190.

66 Whether doth *S: Austin* teach any thing about Antichrist, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of England? 192.

67 Whether doth *S: Austin* hold, that *Enoch* and *Elias* doe yet liue in their bodies? 196.

68 Whether doth *Saint Austin* teach, that at the day of Iudgement Christ shall come with the signe of the Crosse before him? 197.

69 Whether doth *S: Austin* hold Vsurie to be vnlawfull? 197.

70 Whether doth *S: Austin* teach, that Stewes may lawfully bee permitted? 200.

71 Whether doth *S: Austin* teach the lawfull vse of Ceremonies in Christian Religion? 203.

72 Whether doth *S: Austin* teach, that Miracles are now necessary for the confirmation of the Catholike faith? 205.

SAINT

SAINT

AVSTINS SVMMES:

OR,

THE SVMME OF SAINT *AVSTINS* RELIGION.

CAP. I.

Whether was Saint AVSTIN *such a Monke, as thoſe which are at this day allowed by the Church of Rome?*

THere is none (I hope) in this Land, ſo ignorant, but hee is able to decide this queſtion; and to conclude to himſelfe, that there is not more difference betwixt light and darkneſſe, betwixt Heauen and Hell, then there is betwixt the Monkes of the Primitiue Church, and the Monkes of theſe latter times: ſo that this queſtion might well be left vnhandled. Yet for Anſwer to Mr. *Brerely*, who proues that Saint *Auſtin* was a Monke, hoping to gaine ſome credit to

that diſordered Order, and for ſatisfaction to the Reader, who might elſe perhaps bee deluded, to beleeue that all Monkes and their Religion were good, becauſe Saint *Auſtin* was a Monke, I will heere ſhew the difference betweene them out of Saint *Auſtin* himſelfe, and ſo leaue it.

Firſt then, the Monkes of the Primitiue Church (to omit the cauſe which firſt compeld them to this Monkiſh Profeſsion, which was perſecution, as it is reported by *Enſebius, Epiphanius* and *Socrates*; of *Paulus*, who liued *Anno Domini*, 251 of *Antonius*, *Anno Domini*, 300. of *Macarius* and *Euagrius*, who liued about the Age of Saint *Auſtin*) were holy and deuout men, who deſiring to ſerue God and the Church, retyred themſelues from the ouer-burthenſome ſociety of men; *Oſtendite hominibus non vos in ocio facilem victum, ſed per anguſtam & arctam viam, Regnum Dei quærere*: Make it knowne vnto men, that you doe not eat the bread of idleneſſe; but that you ſeeke the Kingdome of God through a ſtrait and narrow way; was Saint *Auſtins* Exhortation to thoſe Monks: but how prophane and irreligious the Monkes of theſe times are; *Qui Monachatum amplectuntur ioſe viuere*; who embrace Monkery, onely that they may liue idly as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes, *ibid. Cap.* 22. is monſtrous to conceiue as I ſhall ſhew anon.

Epiphan. lib. 2. hæreſ. 70 & 79. Socrat. lib 4. hiſt Eccleſ. c. 23. Sozom. lib. 6. hiſt. Eccleſ. c. 32. Lib. de opere Monach. c. 28.

2 To the ancient Monks, things of indifferencie, as of meat, apparell, and other Ceremonies, were left as indifferent: but to your Monkes, nothing is impoſed more ſeuerely, then matters of indifferencie.

3 The ancient Monkes laboured with their hands; *quærebant victum manibus*, ſayes Saint *Auſtin*: *In ſingulis Monaſterijs tum in Ægyptiorum regione, tum in alijs omnibus, proprijs laborant manibus*: In all Monaſteries, aſwell amongſt the Egyptians, as elſewhere, they earne their liuing with their owne hands, ſayes *Epiphanius*; but the ſtiffe and brawny ſides of your idle Monkes will not ſuffer them to worke: and whereas ſome doe pretend that Prayer, Reading and Singing of Pſalmes, is the worke of Monkes;

Ibid. c. 28. & 29. Lib. 3. Hæreſ. 79.

Saint

Saint *Austin* sayes no: *Cui rei vacent, desiderio scire, qui corporaliter operari nolunt? orationibus (inquiunt) Psalmis, Lectioni, & Verbo Dei, sancta plane vita est in Christi suauitate laudabilis; sed Cantica diuina cantare manibus operantes facilè possunt, & ipsum laborem tanquam diuino celeumate consolari:* I desire to know what they would doe, who will not worke corporally? they would giue themselues (they say) to Prayer, Singing of Psalmes, and reading of Gods Word: surely, that is a holy life, and in the delight of Christ very commendable; but they might easily sing Diuine Songs, euen as they worke, & so incourage their labour with a Diuine noyse: But your idle begging Monkes, eating till they stare againe, and deuouring things prepared for honester men, by the example of Birds, mentioned in the Gospell, *tanquam sturni fugari debent,* (as S. *Austin* speakes) they ought to be driuen from euery mans gate, like rauenous Stares from a Ricke of Corne: for my owne part, I'le wish them no harme; (their reformation and conuersion, shall be one obiect of my dayly Deuotion) But I must needs write what Saint *Austin* hath done, *Vtinam isti qui vacare volunt manibus, omninò vacarent & linguis, non tam multos ad imitationem inuitarent, si eis non tantum exempla pigra, sed etiam muta proponerent:* I would to God (saith Saint *Austin*) that those Monkes which will not vse their hands to worke, could not vse their tongues nor teeth (say I) then should they not perswade so many to imitate their lazy life; nor feed themselues so fat, till their own eyes, ashamed to see such Monsters, are ready to start out of their holes.

De opere Monac. c.17.

Ibid. c.22.

Lastly, the ancient Monkes were men; but these Monks are monsters in the shape of men: and that I may speake nothing but what I know, I'le speake nothing but what I haue read. A Monke then in the present state is a Monster, saith *Scaliger*; whose Picture ready drawn to my hand, was lately presented to my view, composed of as many beastly qualities as there are letters in the word (*Monachus:*) And thus it followeth.

The Picture of a Monke in the preſent State, drawne by *Dithmarſe, Prolog. Polit. Sect.* 3.

M	*oribus Simia*; in manners an Ape; *Quicquid agit Mundus, Monachus vult eſſe ſecundus.*
O	*cio Porcus*; in idlenes, a Swine: eating and ſleeping is the deadly life of a liue-leſſe Monke.
N	*idore, Coruus*; In ſmelling after feaſts, as greedy and rauenous as a Crow; and therefore S. *Auſtin* compares them to Stares: *O Monachi, veſtri ſtomachi ſunt Amphora Bacchi*; *Vos eſtis, Deus eſt teſtis, turpiſſima peſtis.*
A	*rte, Vulpes*; In craftines, a Foxe.
C	*orde, Lupus*; In heart, a Wolfe; preying vpon and deuouring the poore flocke of Chriſt, drawing them from the ſheepe-fold at *Bethel*, to the Slaughter-houſe at *Babel.*
H	*æreſi, Polypus*; Changing his Order and Religion, as the *Polypus* doth his colour.
V	*oce, Aſinus*; As ignorant and ſtupid for the moſt part as an Aſſe; being neither able to ſpeake nor write: like a barrell, ſo full that he cānot ſound.
S	*uperbia, Pauo*; In pride, a Peacocke, bragging and boaſting that he is more holy then other men; & that Heauen is due to him by his own deſert.

And here you haue the true Picture of a Romiſh Monke, with the true difference betweene the ancient Monkes & them; ſo that S. *Auſtin* being a Monke, doth nothing at all proue the lawfulneſſe of their Profeſsion; but in plaine termes condemnes it. Iudge then (Iudicious Reader) what Mr. *Brecreley* hath gotten by prouing S. *Auſtin* a Monke, he ouerthrowes the Order of his owne Monkes now eſtabliſhed in the Church of Rome; for in prouing S. *Auſtin* a Monke, he muſt needs approue ſuch Monkes as S. *Auſtin* was, and in allowing of them, he muſt of neceſsity by conſequence condemne the contrary, ſuch as the Monkes of theſe times are.

And

And I am verily perſwaded (Mr. *Brereley*) that you deteſt and abhorre not onely that lazie idleneſſe, but alſo that filthy wickedneſſe, which is practiſed within the limits of euery Cloiſter; but alas, you cannot helpe it: and therefore neuer goe about to defend them, but pray to the Lord of the Haruеſt, that he would reforme them, that he would expell not onely them, but all other loyterers, and thruſt forth true painefull labourers into his Vineyard, that ſo the drowſie ſluggards, and all the idle lazie Drones of this age, being either baniſht the world, or elſe ſet to ſome honeſt Trade, for which God intended them, the fame of the Chriſtian Clergie may flouriſh as farre as euer it did. But of this Queſtion inough; I haſten to thoſe more ſolid Queſtions, which concerne the ſubſtance of Religion; which that I may handle truely, ſoundly and ſincerely, and attaine to the end of my intended labour,

O Æterne Deus, qui in lucе habitas inacceſſa, radijs tuis illumina oculos intellectus mei, ad veritatem intuendam animo, corde credendam, & ore profitendam, per Ieſum Chriſtum.

Chap. II. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Sonne of God is God of God, and not of himſelfe?*

IN fœliciſſimo laborant errore, qui non putant ſe poſſe peruenire ad vnici Patris Gloriam, niſi per vnici Filij contumeliam; ſaith S. *Auſtin*, cited by *Bellarmine*: Moſt vnhappy are thoſe Authors of hereſie, which cannot ſufficiently extoll the glory of the Father, but by ouerthrowing the Deity of the Sonne: and yet Mr. *Brereley*, pretending to prote& himſelfe ſafe from the darts of his aduerſaries, vnder Saint *Auſtins* ſhield, is firſt of all himſelfe made the obie& of this his reprehenſion; affirming for orthodox, That Chriſt is not truely God

Præfatione de deplgen. hoſt. d uinit. Chriſt.

of himſelfe, nor diuine eſſence, but the Offspring of diuine eſſence, making a diſtinction in the eſſence of the Deity, when as Saint *Auſtin* neuer made any but of the perſons: thus derogating from the dignity of Chriſts Diuinity: whereas *Bellarm.* vrges *Epiphanius*, calling Chriſt αὐτοθεον .i. very God of himſelfe.

Bell.lib.2.de Chr.cap.16. Epipan. hæreſ. 69.

But it ſeemes, you would make Saint *Auſtin* to patronize the hereſie of *Greg. Paulus*, who thought it was Satans Stratagemme, to faine in the minds of men, a vnity of primitiue eſſence in the Deity, then which there is nothing more certaine. Firſt therefore, the Sonne may bee ſaid to be God of himſelfe two wayes: 1. *poſitiuè*, poſitiuely, as it may ſignifie a ſelfe-production, either of his abſolute or reſpectiue eſſence: and ſo Saint *Auſtin*, with the Fathers in the Nicene Councell, doth iuſtly deny it. Secondly *negatiuè*, negatiuely; and ſo we ſay, he is God of himſelfe, becauſe he is of no other according to his abſolute nature, being equall to the Father: which equality is interpreted by Saint *Auſtin* (as *Bellarmine* himſelfe confeſſeth) to be in reſpect of his eſſence: Now if he did receiue his eſſence from another, as he is God, he were inferiour to him from whom he did receiue it: *Sed rapinam non eſt arbitratus, ſe eſſe equalem Deo*: He thought it no robbery to make himſelfe equall with God, in reſpect of his abſolute eſſence: and therefore he euer was very God of himſelfe: For as the firſt perſon hath his eſſence from no other, ſo it muſt needs be with the ſecond, elſe could there be no vniuocall equality (in reſpect of eſſence, as that place implies) betweene the Father and the Sonne. But your poſition ſeemes to be defended by Saint *Auſtins* authority; I will cite the places at large, leſt the Reader ſhould thinke himſelfe deluded.

Phil.2.6.

Tom.1.lib.3. de lib.arbit.cap.21.

Tom.10.Serm. 2.de natiu.Chr. Maledictus qui diuinitatem filij Dei, dicit initium habere.

The firſt place that you alledge, to proue that the Deity of Chriſt had beginning from the Father, (though Saint *Auſtin* hath curſt the Author of this opinion) is in theſe words: *Natus eſt de Patre Filius, de Deo Deus, de æterno coæternus: Pater autem, non de Filio Deus, Filius de Patre Deus; ideò Pater Filio gignendo, dedit vt Deus eſſet.* Now

Tom.9.tract.48. in Ioh.pag.352.

whoſoeuer

whosoeuer reads these words of *Austin*, with knowledge & impartialeies, may easily gather from them this conclusion in English: That Christ, as he is the *Sonne* of God, is of and from the *Father*: the *Father* is not God the *Father* by any act of the *Sonne*, but the *Sonne* is God the *Sonne* by an Act of the *Father*; therefore the *Father* by generation gaue to the *Sonne*, that he should be God the *Sonne*. *Filius ad Patrem, Deus ad seipsum refertur*: saith *Austin*: His filiation is referred to the Father, but the Deity to himselfe; negatiuely, as produced of none: The relatiue nature is referred to the Father, but the absolute Deity to himselfe; then which nothing can be spoken against your opinion more plainely. *Tract. 39. in Ioh.*

The second in these: *à quo habet vt sit, ab illo habet vt possit*: From whom he hath his *esse filiationis*, from the same he hath his *posse filiationis*: so that as he is the Sonne, he is inferiour to the Father, and hath both being and power from the Father: which is all any Scholler can gather from that place of *Austine*. *Tract. 106. in Ioh.*

Lastly, you vrge Saint *Austins* saying: *Sic Deus Pater, & Deus de Deo Filius esse simul incipiunt*. To which place I answer, That the nature of the Sonne ought to be considered two wayes. First, *secundùm absolutam Deitatem*: according to his absolute Deity; so it is equall, not deriued, but altogether the same with the nature of the Father. 2. *secundùm respectiuam originem*: as it is *filiata*, according to his respectiue beginning: so the Father is *Fons & principium Filij*. the beginning of the Sonne: and in this sense it is taken, when the Nicen Councell, *Athanasius* Creed, Saint *Austin*, and other of the Fathers say, That the Sonne is *Deus de Deo, lumen de lumine, &c*: God of God, light of light. Which *filiata personalitas*, being the obiect of diuine generation, was deriued from the Father: for the essence of the Deity considered by it selfe, hath no beginning, onely the person of the Son, in respect of its filiation, hath beginning, being, life & power from the Father; so that *Filius* is *primus à primo*, but *Filius Deus* is *primus, sed à nullo*: The Sonne is said to bee first from the first; but *Tom. 6. cont. ser. Arria. c. 34.*

the

the Deity of the Sonne is firſt, and from no other: whoſe abſolute eſſence did coexiſt of it ſelfe in the firſt moment of Eternity, coequall with the Deity of the firſt Perſon in Trinity; but his reſpectiue eſſence, (as I ſaid before) his filiation, had its beginning by the firſt reflection of the diuine vnderſtanding vpon it ſelfe; which is the plaine tenent of Saint *Auſtin*, maintained by the Church of England at this day. Let but an indiferent eye (not pre-occupated in opinion) conferre this which hath been ſpoken, with Mr. *Brereleys* allegations, and the ſeeming Controuerſie will be ended.

Lege *Lib.5. authoris, de Trin. inter oper. Aug. tom.3. Epiſt. Aug. 174. ad Paſcentium. Lib.1. Pet. Lumb. diſtinct. 5. lib.1. Kekerm. dantiſc. ſyſtem. theolog. pag.21.*

What *Melanct.* the *Tigurin Diuines*, *Pezelius*, *Tilenus*, and others haue writ, I dare (without danger to that which hath bin deliuered) refer it to the iudgement of any who can at leiſure peruſe their writings. All that learned *Zanchie* ſayes in his tract *de tribus Elohim*, or in his Epiſtles, is, That the eſſence of the Father is in the Sonne: and that Chriſt is the Sonne of God, not by adoption, not by aſsimilation, againſt *Fotinus*; not by vnion of conſent, not by participation of diuine ſimilitude, nor by excellency of nature onely, againſt *Arius* and *Eunomius*; but by actuall generation from all eternity, againſt *Sabellius*, which is ſound and conſonant to the truth: for when wee ſpeake ſimply of the eſſence of the Son of God, without relation to the Father, then we truely ſay, that he is God of himſelfe, *negatiuè*, negatiuely: but when wee ſpeake of him, conſidering the relation between him and his Father, then we ſay righly, that the Father is the beginning of the Son; neither dare *Bellarmine* call this opinion erroneous.

Lib.2. de Chriſt. cap. 19.

Neither can Mr. *Brerely* auoid one hereſie, which hee neceſſarily falls into, by defending his aſſertion; It was the eighth poſition of *Valentius Gnentilis*: *Quòd ſolus Pater eſt αυτοθεος*: That the Father only was God of himſelfe, as *Bellarm.* affirmes: therfore, if the Sonne be not *αυτοθεος*, nor the holy Ghoſt *αυτοθεος*, as he is of opinion, then the Father onely is *αυτοθεος*: which is condemned by *Bellarm.* as an *Arian* hereſie: for which the Poet nips him: *Incidit in Syllam cupiens vitare Charybdim*: a defended errour hath

Lib.2. de Chriſt. cap. 2.

Hæreſis Ariana patrocinatur à Brereleo.

hath brought him into Hereſie; in which I muſt neceſſarily leaue him, but will neuer ceaſe to pray vnto the Lord, that he would with the calme blaſts of his mercy awake him and the reſt; that ſo, their Soules may bee ſaued in the great Day of the Lord: For, in this queſtion, which hee might haue well forborne, ſeeing *Bellarmine* acknowledges it to bee a verball, and no reall Controuerſie; yet you ſee that there is no difference betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Churchof England.

Bel. lib. & cap. prædict.

SECT. 2.

Whether doth Saint AVSTIN *teach, that God is no Author of ſinne, and that hee did reprobate ſome to Damnation?*

AVthoritatem dum malè intelligunt homines, de medicamentis ſibi vulnera faciunt: ſaith Saint *Auſtin*: Miſapplying of Authority for the moſt part brings forth Hereſie: ſo Mr. *Brereley* alleadges many ſweet and comfortable Sentences out of S. *Auſtin*; but by wreſting them, or ſeeming to wreſt them to ſerue his own purpoſe, makes them ſound dangerous to an vnlearned eare. Let vs therefore weigh his prooſes in the ballance of truth, and wee ſhall find them farre too light; either nothing to the queſtion, or nothing againſt the Truth maintained in the Church of England.

Serm. 61. de tempore; ſi ſit Auguſtini; nam Ser. de temp. dubia & ſuſpectæ ſunt authoritatis, teſtib. Eraſm. & Mart. Lypſ.

Firſt, he proues, that God is not the Author of the euill will of man; which I grant to bee indeed the Doctrine of Saint *Auſtin*, drawne from the Word of God; but it makes nothing againſt the Chriſtian Truth profeſt in the Church of England; that God is the Author of the will of man, and of all the actions which flow from the ſame, but not of the obliquity of the actions, as one of your owne Schoole affirmes: onely, in loue, I would aduiſe my vnknowne Aduerſary hereafter, to looke better to his Quo-

Tom. 7. de peccat. merit. & remiſſ. c. 18.

Greg. Arimin.

tations; for in that place of *Auſtin*, (though it bee his tenent elſewhere) there is no ſuch thing to be ſeene.

Tom. 3. Aug. de ſpirit. & lit. cap. 31.

2 Hee proues, that God is not the Author of ſinne, which is moſt true; neither did the Church of England euer contradict it: but with theſe and the like falſe accuſations, you ſhew your ſelues to be ſuch Romanes as *Martiall* complained of in his time;

Mart. *Turba grauis paci, placidæque inimica quieti*;

a company that deſire, where you find none, to make diuiſion; I remember, it was *Cæſars* Motto, *inuenire aut facere*, either to find or make a way for his vnlimited fury to enter: ſo it is your chiefe glory, either to find or make debate, if that by any meanes the fury of Hereſie might haue free entrance vpon the flouriſhing Stage of Great Brittaine, and bee receiued as a Chriſtian Verity. But he that is the Author of this thy proſperity, will ſtill protect thee, (O England) (if thou bee'ſt not ingrateſull) from all new-found Ieſuitiſme, or any other adulterating Noueltie.

Tom. 7. lib. 6. Hypognoſt. Bell. lib. de ſcript. Eccleſ. Titulos Græcos ſuis lib. indere non ſolet Auguſtinus: S. *Auſtin* neuer gaue any of his Bookes a title in Greek.

The 3. place is none of *Auſtins*, *Libri qui inſcribuntur Hypognoſticon, phraſin non habent Auguſtini*; Thoſe bookes which are ſo intituled, haue not Saint *Auſtins* phraſe; ſaith *Bellarmine*. *Auſtin* was not the Author, but ſome counterfeiting *Pelagian*, ſaith *Andreas*; *Eraſmus* and *Angelus Rocca* a Ieſuite are both of the ſame opinion. That it is cited by *Lombard*, *lib.* 4. *ſent. diſt.* 21. *pag.* 813. proues it ancient, but not *Auſtin* to bee the Author; and *Auſtins* Religion cannot be proued but from his owne vndoubted Works. And therfore I think it is ſufficient, if I ſet downe in few words the opinion of Saint *Auſtin*, the agreement of the Catholike Church with him, and ſo conclude this Controuerſie.

Tom. 3. de ſpirit. & lit. ad Marcell. c. 31.

For the firſt, That God is not the Author of any euill; I'le ſeeke no further, but onely to the place alleadged by Mr. *Brereley*: *Si omnis voluntas ſit à Deo; tum etiam mala voluntas: ſic Deus eſſet Author peccati; quod abſit:* If euery will were from God; then alſo the euill will: and ſo wee ſhould make God the Author of ſinne; which be farre from

vs.

vs. So Saint *Auſtin* ſayes in another place, that God did foreknow onely, and not will ſinne. Now, the will of God is two-fold: Firſt, ſpeciall; by which God did will to approue and affect any thing himſelfe, which is called, *voluntas particularis approbationis*, and ſo hee wils onely that which is good (this is called by ſome, *voluntas bene-placiti, conſequens & abſoluta.*) 2. The ſecond, is general; wherby he wils ſomething, onely in reſpect of toleration; which is called, *voluntas ſigni antecedens conditionata, & vniuerſalis permiſſionis*; and ſo he may be ſaid to will euill permiſsiue: which diſtinction is confirmed by Saint *Auſtin*, in his *Enchirid. cap. 27.* God thought it better to doe good with euill, then to permit no euill to bee: yet, the will of God permitting, is not the formall or efficient cauſe of the fault; but the euill will of man, left to it ſelfe: ſo that, Gods fore-knowledge takes not away the freedome of mans will *.

Quiſque malus, ſuis maleſactis author eſt: Auguſt. Tom. 1. lib. 1 de libero arb. c. 1. & c. 2. credimus Deum non eſſe peccati Authorem. Velle præcepit, poſſe præbuit, & non impunè nolle permiſit. Aug. lib. 3. de libero arbit. c. 16.

** Quis enim peccat in eo quod nullo modo cauevi poteſt? Aug. lib. prædeſt. &c.*

For the ſecond, that God did reprobate ſome to damnation, *Bellarmine* confeſſeth it to bee Saint *Auſtins* opinion.

Bel. lib. 2. de grat. & lib. arb. c. 16.

Reprobation, according to Saint *Auſtins* learning (ſaith *Bellarmine*, is nothing elſe but Gods predeſtinating to deſtruction; which is a truth ſo euident in Saint *Auſtin*, that I wonder Mr. *Brereley* was not aſhamed to write the contrary: *Una hominum ſocietas prædeſtinata eſt in æternum regnare cum Deo; altera, æternum ſubire ſupplicium cum Diabolo:* One company of men are predeſtinated to raigne eternally with God; another, to vndergo eternall puniſhment with the Diuell. And did not God then reprobate ſome to damnation? *Quomodò dicit Chriſtus, Non eſtis ex ouibus meis, quia videbat eos ad ſempiternum interitum prædeſtinatos, &c?* How could Chriſt ſay, You are not of my Sheepe, vnleſſe hee had ſeene that they were predeſtinated to euerlaſting damnation? And, did not God then reprobate ſome to damnation? *Filius perditionis, perditioni prædeſtinatus:* The ſonne of perdition was predeſtinated to perdition, ſaith *Auſtin*. Which ſpeeches proue plainely, that Saint *Auſtin* taught, that God did reprobate ſome to

Tom. 5. lib. 15. de Ciuit. Dei, c. 1.

Tom. 9. Tract. 48. in Joh.

Tract. 107 in Ioh.

damnation: neither doth Mr. *Brereley* cite one word out of *Auſtins* owne Workes to the contrary.

Now that the Reader may perceiue that the Church of England doth not at all diſſent from *Auſtin*, in this queſtion, let him obſerue theſe two concluſions taught & maintained by the true Catholike Church.

Profusè non eſſe confitemur, vt tribuantur peccata noſtra Creatori, Aug. lib. 3. de libero arbit. c. 16.

Firſt, that God is not the Author of ſinne: Man is the actiue Author; God, only the permitter: God ſuſtaines the motion of the will; but Man defiles the act of willing: God concurres to the action; Man, to the deformity in the action: As darknesſe followes, when the Sunne withdrawes his light, and yet the Sunne is not the cauſe of darknes: ſo when God withdrawes his grace, ſinne followes, not as an effect, his cauſe; but onely as a conſequent, his Antecedent.

If any deſire greater manifeſtation of this Concluſion, hee muſt know that ſinne may bee conſidered two wayes: First, *in ingreſſu*; and ſo God may bee thought to bee the Author two wayes: First, *impellendo voluntatem ad peccatum*; by inforcing the will to ſinne; which was the blaſphemous Hereſie of *Florinus*: Secondly, *gratiam denegando*; by denying grace; which may be done two wayes: either by denying that grace, without which man cannot but fall; this we may not aſcribe to God; or of that without which God ſees he cannot ſtand, though in reſpect of his will, hee might if hee would; and this may bee aſcribed to the Lord. *Deus dedit Adamo poſſe quod vellet, ſed non dedit velle quod potuit:* God gaue to *Adam* power to doe what hee would; but not will to doe what hee could; ſaith Saint *Auſtin*.

D. Fiel. lib. 3. de Eccleſ. c. 23.

Auguſt. lib. de correp. & gra.

Secondly, ſinne may bee conſidered *in progreſſu*; and ſo God may be truly ſaid to limit the ſinner in ſinning at this or that time; to order the ſinner, in ſinning in this or that kinde; and laſtly, to puniſh one ſinne with another; and all this, without being Author or cauſe of any ſinne at all.

The ſecond Concluſion is, That God is the Author of Reprobation; and conſequently, of damnation: this is plaine,

plaine, by the definition giuen by *Aquinas: Eſt actus Dei prouidentiæ, permittendi aliquem cadere in culpam, & inferendi damnationis pœnam pro culpa:* It is an act of Gods prouidence, permitting ſome to fall into ſin, and bringing the puniſhment of Damnation vpon them for ſin: and in it we may conſider two Acts. The firſt Negatiue; *Nolo miſereri*, hauing a purpoſe to paſſe by ſome, without any other knowne cauſe to vs, then his will. The ſecond is Affirmatiue; *Volo punire;* proceeding from the Iuſtice of GOD, not without ſome intuitiue reſpect, both to Actuall and Originall ſinne: ſo that, Reprobation is not the cauſe of the fault, (that proceeds from the corrupted Will of Man left to it ſelfe) but it is rather indeed, the cauſe of the puniſhment due to the fault.

Aquin. parte 1. ſum. q. 23. art. 3. Lege Auguſt. lib. 3. de libero arbit. c. 11. tom. 1. & lib. 5. cont. Julian Pelag. tom. 7.

Now to aske a reaſon, why God chooſes this man, and paſſes by that, is forbidden by Saint *Auſtin, Noli velle iudicare, ſi non vis errare; punit homines iſto modo, nec ideò iniuſtè, quia occultè:* Iudge not, if thou wouldeſt not iudge falſly; it pleaſes God to puniſh men ſo; yet not vniuſtly, becauſe ſecretly.

Tom. 3. lib. de ſpirit. & lit.

And thus farre, you ſee, Saint *Auſtins* Religion goes hand in hand with the Religion now taught in the Church of England; yea, and moſt of your owne Writers confeſſe as much as I haue ſaid: Let not that therefore bee condemned for an Hereſie in the Church of England, which goes for Orthodoxe and true in the Workes of *Gregor. Arimineſ. Cardin. Camaracenſ. Occham, Medina, Durand, Aquin. Bannes, & Bellar.* leſt, by that meanes, your ouer-glittering Religion receiue a leſſe gracious welcome from the ignorant, then heeretofore it hath done; when they ſhall perceiue themſelues ſo groſly to bee abuſed, in beleeuing by an implicit-no-Faith, what euer you propound to them without examination of truth or Antiquity.

And let Mr. *Brereley* but expound the Writers of our Church as gently, fauourably, and yet truely,

as hee hath done the reſt of Romes Fauorites; and I am ſure there can bee found no contrariety in their Workes, concerning this ſuppoſed Controuerſie: onely my deſire to vindicate S. *Auſtin* and the Church of England from this Calumnie of the Ieſuites, hath made me ouer-tedious; but my compendious breuity in the next, ſhal recompence this my former prolixity.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Avstin *teach, that God did command any thing in it owne nature, impoſſible to be done?*

Quis peccat in eo quod nullo modo cauere poteſt? Who ſinnes in that which hee can by no meanes ſhun; ſaith Saint *Auſtin*, cited before? If Gods Commandement to *Adam* had beene ſimply impoſsible; then had hee ſinned of neceſsity, and not of free liberty: which to affirme, were to make God the cauſe impulſiue to ſin: which is Arch-blaſphemy: and therefore God commanded nothing in it owne nature ſimply impoſsible; neither *quoad ſubſtantiam præcepti*; according to the ſumme & ſubſtance of the commandement; nor *quoad intenſionem Præcipientis*; nor according to the mind and meaning of the Commander; if you take this word (*impoſſibile*) properly, excluding all poſsibility; not if it bee taken improperly, including a difficulty; for then we ſay, that the commandement was impoſsible, *i.* difficult, as wofull experience taught the firſt Lord-Keeper of Paradiſe.

Lege Gab. lib. 2. diſtinct. 28. art. 1.

Bonauent. lib. 1. diſtin. 42. queſt. 3

I need not ſtand to proue this Concluſion out of *Auſtin*, Mr. *Brereley* hath ſaued me that labour; and *Pet. de Palu.* brands him with *Anathema* that teaches the contrary: onely hee ſayes, that the Church of England defends this Herefie againſt Saint *Auſtin* and all Antiquity.

Lib. 4. diſt. 38. q. 3. art. 4.

They

They ſay, It is a ſhame to bely the Diuell, but Mr. *Brereley* thinkes it no ſhame to belye the ſpot-leſſe Spouſe of Chriſt; elſe hee would neuer haue made her the Patroneſſe of ſuch a baſe aſſertion. It is not ignorance; but a fellonious act of trecherous enuy, to rob her of her good name, & to diſcourage her Children:

Iudice non opus eſt, noſtris nec vindice libris;
Stat contra, dicitq́; tibi tua pagina, Fur es. *Mart. lib. 1. Epig 54.*

for, the true Catholike Church maintaines with Saint *Auſtin*, that God did command nothing in it owne nature impoſsible to be done.

Now, the Commandements of God may bee ſaid to bee impoſsible two wayes: Firſt, *Naturâ propriâ, & ex voluntate imperantis*; in their owne nature, and by the will of him that gaue them. So *Auſtin* is to bee vnderſtood in thoſe two Sermons cited by you; for it is blaſphemy to ſay, that God did command any thing of ſet purpoſe, which by it owne nature was impoſsible to bee done. Secondly, *Animi laſſitudine*, (as *Hierome* ſpeaks) *& actione obedientis*; through weakneſſe of mind in him that ſhould obey the commandement; ſo the commandements are impoſsible to be kept; *Non vitio legis, non impletur lex, ſed vitio carnis*, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*; that the commandements cannot now bee kept, is not to bee imputed to the Lawes impoſsibility, but to mans frailty. So that the commandements are poſsible; but man wants ability to doe what is poſsible; not by Creation; but by his owne ſinfull action: For the Commandements of God were made to man ſimply, and not to man as hee had made himſelfe vnable to performe them by his fall: though they were diuulged from Mount *Horeb*, ſince the fall of *Adam*; yet they were giuen in the ſecret Counſell of God long before.

Lege Auguſt. lib. 2. Retract. c. 33.

Lib. de ſpirit. & lit. c. 19.

Baptizatos per omnia poſſe legem Dei implere, fuit error Origenis, hom. 8. in Exod. 2. in Cant. & lib. 1 in Iob.

Againe, the Commandements of God are ſaid to bee kept, and ſo now to bee poſsible in reſpect of man; *Quando condonatur, quod non obſeruatur*; when the defects of humane frailty are ſupplyed by the death of Diuine humanity; as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes: And in the 23. Chapter of the firſt Booke of his Retractat. *Lex impletur, non niſi à ſpiri-*

Lib. 1. Retract. c. 19.

In iſdem mandatis eſt etiam quod iubemur Dicere, dimitte nobis debita noſtra.

ſpiritalibus: A regenerate man fulfils the Law in this life: *quandò quicquid non fit, ignoſcitur:* when that which is not done, is pardoned. Now, that this which I haue ſpoken, was the onely opinion of Saint *Auſtin*, it will moſt manifeſtly appeare to any that reades his 16. *cap. de gra. & libero arb. ad Valent. Dicunt Pelagiani, Non iuberet Deus quod ſciret ab homine non poſſe fieri; Quis hoc neſciat?* The Pelagians did obiect to S. *Auſtin* the very ſame which you doe to the Church of England; God would not command that which was impoſsible; *Quis hoc neſcit*, ſaith hee; Who knowes not that? *ſed ideò iuſſit aliqua quæ non poſſumus, &c.* (as the Father goes on in his anſwer to thoſe Heretickes) therefore God commanded ſome things which now we cannot performe, that wee might know what to pray vnto him for: *Fides orando impetrat, quod lex imperat:* Faith makes that eaſie, which to corrupted nature was and is impoſsible to be done.

Lege Auguſt. lib. 9. Confeſſ. cap. 13. & Epiſt. 92.

God fore-ſaw from the beginning, that man would abuſe the liberty of his will; and yet being not tyed to giue him his aſsiſting grace, gaue him Cómandements; as if he had been to haue continued in his created ability: which, God knowing hee would not, and that afterwards hee would bee vnable to fulfill the Law, (which cries out in a thundering Dialect; Doe this, or dye) hee prouided another remedy, euen the death and paſsion of his owne Son, who was ſent from Heauen to Earth, ecchoing forth the calme ſound of mercy; Beleeue onely, and thou ſhalt liue. They therefore that can fulfill the Law, haue no need of the death of Chriſt; but all that haue need of Saluation, haue need alſo of the death of Chriſt: and therefore, ſince the fall of *Adam*, none can actually fulfill the Law.

Ambroſ. in com. ſuper Galat. c. 3.

Bern. ſerm. 5. ſuper Cant.

This is the firſt and ancient Truth, taught by Chriſt and the Fathers of the Primitiue Church; whateuer is contrary to this, is to bee auoyded as new and counterfeit: *Quod primum, illud verum; quod poſterius, adulterinum*, ſaith *Tertullian*: That truth which is moſt ancient, is moſt true.

Thus you ſee what Saint *Auſtins* Religion was, concerning

cerning the fulfilling of the Law; which is in nothing contradicted by the Church of England. I will end this Chapter with the words of the ſame Father: *Lex data eſt, vt Gratia quæreretur; Gratia data eſt, vt Lex impleretur:* The Law was giuen, that Grace might bee ſought; and Grace was giuen, that the Law might bee fulfilled. *Lib. de Sp. & lit. cap. 10.*

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Avstin *teach, that Chriſt ſuered according to his Deity?*

PAſſion is ſo peculiar to Mortality, that it can by no meanes bee tranſlated to a Deity: ſo that all the ſufferings of our Sauiour inuented by cruelty, writ in blood, and ſealed with an enuious death, were terminated in his humane nature, ſuſtained by the Deity: whether his Sufferings were priuatiue or poſitiue, I am ſure, to vs they were all perfectiue, bringing vs into the right way to Heauen, when the firſt created *Adam*, by ſeeking knowledge, had loſt himſelfe (in the little compaſſe of Paradiſe) and all his Poſterity: though hee ſuffered in Soule more then intentionally; yet his death is truely to bee attributed to the fleſh onely: *Mors Domini noſtri non fuit in Anima, ſed in Carne ſola*, ſaith *Auſtin*: The death of our Lord was not in Soule, but in the Fleſh onely: neither doth the Church of England any thing at all diſſent from him; only Mr. *Brereley* names three which are of a contrary opinion. Now the opinion of two or three condemned by the reſt, cannot bee a point of Religion; and therefore for this time wee might ſhake hands, and part friends: but becauſe I intend to follow Mr. *Brereley* in his quotations to the end of his Booke; or, at leaſt, of as much of it as concernes Saint *Auſtin*; I will heere alſo briefly ſhew what paines hee hath taken to make that manifeſt which we maintaine. *Cont. Card. Cameri. lib. 1 ſent. q. 2. art. 1. Scr. 181.*

The firſt place which hee vrges to proue, that Chriſt ſuffered not according to his Diuinity, is, out of thoſe words of Saint *Auſtin*; *Alia eſt Hæreſis (inquit Auguſt.) quæ dicit diuinitatem in Chriſto doluiſſe, &c.* There is another Hereſie which ſaith, that the Diuinity in Chriſt ſuffered (as Mr. *Brereley* tranſlates it.) Which is true, though Mr. *Brereley*, either through forgetfulneſſe, or of ſet purpoſe, doth miſconſter the place: for *(doluiſſe)* in his Engliſh muſt ſignifie (to haue ſuffered) when as there is a great difference, (though griefe be a Paſsion) betwixt *dolore* and *pati*; ſpeaking with reſpect to the death of Chriſt. But let that paſſe; for it is certaine, that his Deity was not grieued properly. The 2. is, *ex tom. 3. de Agone Chriſtiano, cap. 23.* ſo, in his Epiſtle to *Euod. Rectè dicitur Deus crucifixus, cùm hoc eum ſecundum carnem paſſum eſſe, non ſecundum illud, quo Dominus gloriæ*: It is truely ſaid, God was crucified, when as he ſuffered onely according to his Humanity, and not according to that whereby he is the Lord of glory: which is altogether agreeable to the Doctrine and Religion now taught and maintained in the Church of England; as it will euidently appeare to any that will impartially examine but this one Concluſion:

Tom. 6. de hæreſ. Hæreſ. 73.

Tom. 2. epiſt. 102.

That humane nature ſimply conſidered, did not ſuffer and die for vs men, and our ſaluation, but ſuch humane nature, as hauing a ſtrict and ineffable vnion with the Diuinity, was made one Perſon with the Sonne of God; ſo that it may bee truely ſaid, *Deus crucifixus erat*; God was crucified; (as S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks to *Euodius*) and yet his Diuinity remaine impatible, being crucified onely according to his Humanity vnited to the Deity: which, being conſidered, the leaſt child may eaſily perceiue, that there is no diſſention about Chriſts Paſsion, betweeu S. *Auſtin* and the Church of England.

SECT. 5.

Sect. 5.

Whether doth Saint Avstin *teach, that Chriſt is our Mediator, onely according to his Humane Nature?*

IT is a Principle in Saint *Auſtin*, That the Mediator muſt bee a middle nature betweene two extremes; a middle, I ſay, not of abnegation, but of formall participation, of neceſsity participating of both natures: ſo that to make a Mediator, is required, not God nor Man ſeparated, but both vnited. Chriſt ſimply conſidered, is equall to the Father in primitiue Eſſence, and ſo cannot be a Mediator; but that Perſon which conſiſts of Diuine Humanity and humane Diuinity, makes a compleat Mediator, who was both *Medium colligantiæ, & congruentæ*, (as the Schoolemen ſpeake) turning diſſention into Vnion, and making an euerlaſting Peace betweene God and Man. Now, if Diuinity and Humanity be both required to make vp a perfect Mediator; Chriſt cannot bee our Mediator, according to one onely, but both are required; therefore hee is not our Mediator according to his Humane nature only; neither haue I read any Poſition more euidently maintained in all Saint *Auſtin*; and yet heere I thinke it conuenient to propoſe to the Reader Mr. *Brereley's* quotations, that ſo he may ſee with what little probability he defends his Aſſertion. Heare Saint *Auſtin* ſpeaking in his owne Language, *Vt Mediator daretur nobis per ineffabilem gratiam, Verbum Caro factum eſt*; That a Mediator by vnſpeakable grace might bee giuen vnto vs, the Word was made Fleſh: *Ergo*, Chriſt is our Mediator, according to his Humane nature onely. This muſt needs be Mr. *Brereley's* Concluſion. How weake, and inartificiall it is, againſt the Rules of Logicke, truth and Antiquity, let any indifferent Reader iudge: who, I know, cannot chooſe but ſmile ſecretly, to ſee how weakly hee defends his new Religion. Some other places are alleadged to the ſame purpoſe, as

Tom. 9. Tract. 82. in Ioh.

you may read them cited in the Margent. From all which nothing can be gathered but this; That Chriſt is not our Mediator as God ſimply, but as God and Man; the Perſon of Chriſt, which is the ſubſtance of the Mediator, being compoſed of theſe two natures, Diuinity and Humanity: furthermore, in the action of Mediation, (as it is granted on both ſides) there are two things neceſſarily required: the firſt is authority actiue, which muſt needs bee referred to the Diuinity; the other is his paſsiue Miniſtery, which reſpects the Humanity: ſo that both natures are required, (as I ſaid before) to make vp a perfect Mediator.

Tom. 3. in Pſal. 110. ver. 4.
Tom. 6. lib. 16. cont. Fauſt. Man. c. 15.
Tom. 3. lib. 1. de Trinit. c. 7.
Tom. 2. Epiſt. 59. ad Paul.

And that this is the opinion and meaning of Saint *Auſtin*, in all thoſe places before cited, it will manifeſtly appeare to any that reads his Book or Homily *de Ouibus*; the words are theſe; *Non Mediator homo, præter Deitatem, non Mediator Deus, præter Humanitatem; Diuinitas ſine Hmanitate non eſt Mediatrix, nec humanitas ſine diuinitate, ſed inter diuinitatem ſolam, & humanitatem ſolam, mediatrix eſt humana diuinitas, & diuina humanitas Chriſti:* ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Behold the Man-Mediator, then which, nothing can bee ſpoken more plaine: That Chriſt is not Mediator, as he is God or Man, but as God and Man; not Diuinity alone, nor Humanity alone, (ſaith *Auſtin*) but diuine Humanity, and humane Diuinity make vp the Perſon of the Mediator.

Tom. 3. c. 12.

And here let a ſilent kinde of Modeſty (if grace and nature haue not both forſaken him) cauſe Mr. *Brereley* to bluſh for ſhame, to ſee how the Mother of his own Deuotion hath made his ſimplicity known to the world, for imputing that to ſo learned a Father, which is manifeſt to the contrary. But I know, your only reaſon is (Mr. *Brereley*) hereby, to make your ignorant Proſelytes beleeue, (who either cannot, or dare not examine what you teach) that our Religion is contrary to the Profeſsion of the Primitiue Fathers, which you can neuer truely performe: when you are able, ſend me word, and I'le change my opinion: till then, giue me leaue to beleeue what is taught by *Auſtin*, & profeſt in the Church of England: That Chriſt is not our Mediator as God, nor as Man; but as God and Man.

SECT. 6.

Sect. 6.

Whether doth Saint Avstin *teach, that Christ from his Natiuity was free from all kind of ignorance, according to his Humanity?*

FOr the better vnderstanding of this question, you must consider, that there is a twofold ignorance: The first is positiue, being formerly distinguished from knowledge, by the obiect, in dissenting from truth, and assenting to error; free election being presupposed, which may be called *ignorantia erronea*, or *praua dispositionis*. To suppose this to haue been in Christ, were impious. The 2. is Negatiue, which is also twofold; including, either, *negationem infinitantem*, simply denying knowledge, and all aptitude to knowledge; which to haue beene in Christ, is altogether to bee denyed: or, *negationem priuantem*, denying some knowledge, whereof the subiect is capable in due time. This priuatiue ignorance; is also twofold; the first is, *irrationalis*, brutish and vnreasonable ignorance, such as was in vs, and is in our Children being first borne; and it is called by *Iunius*, *ignorantia miserabilis*, a miserable kind of ignorance; from which Christ was free, as Saint *Austin* teaches in the place by you cited: *Quam ignorãtiam nullo modo crediderim fuisse in infante illo, in quo Verbum Caro factum, &c.* Which kind of ignorance I would by no meanes beleeue to haue been in that Child, in whom the Word was made Flesh. The second is, *rationalis*, a reasonable ignorance, as when a person may bee ignorant of many things, *quæ scire sibi non expedit*, which are not expedient for him to know at such an age, and yet bee free from the other miserable ignorance; and this Saint *Austin* affirmes to haue beene in Christs Humanity, as the words immediately following doe import: *Sed quia in eo erat similitudo carnis peccati, mutationes ætatum perpeti voluit, ab ipsa exorsus infantia, &c.* But becaus there was in him the similitude of sinfull flesh, hee was willing to

Lib. 4. in Bellar.

Tom. 7. lib. 2. de peccat. mer. & remiss. c. 29.

ſuffer the changes of age, beginning with infancie: it was not expedient that Chriſts Humanity ſhould bee omniſcient; becauſe it is an incommunicable property belonging to the Deity. Now, that incommunicable properties ſhould be communicated, implies a contradiction; therefore, wee ſay, that after the hypoſtaticall Vnion, each nature did retaine what was peculiar to it ſelfe; the Deity, what was proper to the Deity; and the Humanity, what was proper to the Humanity; elſe, there would haue beene a confuſion of the natures, which Mr. *Brereley* will bee affraid (I know) to affirme: But ſome kind of ignorance is proper to Humanity, which is called by your Schoolmen, *bona, vel indifferens ignorantia*; a good, or an indifferent ignorance. And therefore if Chriſt tooke vpon him the whole nature of man (ſinne excepted) hee muſt needs bee ſubiect to ſome kind of ignorance, which did eſſentially belong to that nature; and the Scripture ſayes, hee increaſed in knowledge as hee was man: which neceſſarily implies, that hee was ſubiect to ſome kind of ignorance, at leaſt *comparatiuè*, from his Natiuity: (*Mutationes ætatum perpeti voluit, ab ipſa exorſus infantia*) Hee was willing to ſuffer the changes of age, beginning with the very infancie, ſaith *Auſtin*. Exempting his Deity, we muſt ſtill vnderſtand it with reſpect to his Humanity. Chriſt from his birth had a diuine knowledge, and an infuſed knowledge conſiſting *in Dei viſione*, in the ſeeing of God, as *Aquinas* ſpeakes; and ſo hee is truely ſaid to bee free from that ignorance, which is oppoſed onely *obiectiuè* to theſe acts; but not from that ignorance which is taken away by the operation *intellectus agentis*, of the actiue intellect, which doth make new *ſpecies* intelligible, by abſtracting them from the phantaſmes. Thus did Chriſt as man increaſe in knowledge; as the ſoundeſt Scholler of the Roman Church confeſſes: there was in the ſoule of Chriſt an *intellectus agens*, an actiue vnderſtanding, whoſe propertie it is to make *ſpecies* intelligible by abſtraction: & therefore beſides his innate knowledge, hee muſt needs increaſe in experimentall knowledge, both *practicè* and *theoricè*, be-

Vnio naturarum non confundit earum proprietates, Keckerm. lib. 3. Syſtem. Theolog.

Lege Nazianz. orat. in Baſ. Ambroſ. in verba Lucæ Euang. c. 2. 52. Damaſ. Lib. 4. de fide Orthod. c. 19.

Aquin. per 3 q. 9. art. 4.

Thoſe *gratiæ habituales* which did immediatly follow the Vnion, were moſt excellent, yet did they not take away the properties of his Humanity.

becauſe new ſpecies were daily offered to his phantaſie. Neither doth *Euſebius*, *Ambroſe*, nor *Hierome* teach any thing to the contrary. As for thoſe Hereticks which were called *Agnoita*, they held, that Chriſt was ſubiect to ignorance according to his diuinity; which wee deny: and therefore you wrong our Church, to thinke it is at all tainted with that Hereſie.

That place which is alledged, ſerues nothing at all for his purpoſe: for firſt *Auſtin* ſaies, *Nullo modo crediderim*, I had not beleeued any ignorance to haue beene in the Childe Ieſus: *ſed quia*, but becauſe there was in him the ſimilitude of ſinfull fleſh, becauſe of his humanity, therefore hee ſuffered the changes of age; beginning with ignorance, fitting his infancy. 2. That ſuch brutiſh ignorance as wee ſee in children, was not in the humanity of Chriſt, which hath beene already granted. And here (courteous Reader) thou maiſt boldly reſt thy ſelfe, and beleeue that Chriſt, as man, was ſubiect to ſome kind of ignorance, as he teſtifies of himſelfe, That the day of Iudgement knows no man, no not the Sonne of man (as man) but the Father onely. Which is the primitiue Truth, taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and maintained by the Church of *England*.

SECT. 7.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Chriſt deſcended into Hell?*

NEque enim ipſo die, in Cœlo futurus erat homo Ieſus Chriſtus, ſed in inferno, ſecundùm animam, in ſepulchro, ſecundùm carnem: In the day of his Paſsion, the man Chriſt Ieſus was not to bee in heauen, but in hell, according to his ſoule, & in the graue, according to his fleſh, ſaith *Auſtin*; vrging that place in the Pſalme: *Non derelinques animam meam in inferno, &c.* Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in hell, &c. So in another place; *Quis niſi infidelis, negauerit fuiſſe apud inferos Chriſtum?* Who but an Infidell, will deny that Chriſt was in hell? If I ſhould now goe

Tom. 2. Epiſt. 57. ad Dardanum, ſol. 1. queſt.

Tom. 2. epiſt. 99. ad Euod.

goe about by distinctions to rob Saint *Austine* of his meaning, my conscience would tell me with reiteration, that my pen were Traitour to my heart: for I doe verily beleeue that Saint *Austine* was of this opinion; neither is it repugnant to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, which teaches, that Christ dyed for vs, was buried, and descended into hell; agreeing with the godly and religious confession of the Electors, and Princes of *Germany*: only the difference lyes about the manner and end of his descent; which thing, (*quia solâ fide comprehendi potest*: because it cannot be comprehended but by faith onely, being not reueiled vnto vs) it were far better to be kept in silence, then to be disputed of, further to disquiet the members of Christ; it is onely beleeued here, and shall be reueiled hereafter: and what-euer others thinke or haue writ, I am sure Mr. *Caluine* (whom you chiefely strike at, in naming Dr. *Willet* and Dr. *Fulk*) saies, That it is precise curiositie, not to admit this Article of Christs descent into the Creed: *Austine* doth not exclude it, nor the Church of *England*.

Articulo 3. eccl. Angl. c. against Carlile and Banister.

Aqu. 3. part. sum. q. 52. art. 1.

Lib. 2. institut. c. 16 sect. 8. circa medium.

SECT. 8.

Whether doth Saint Austin *teach, that the naturall body of Christ can be vpon earth without circumscription?*

F*As audire iocos, leuioraq́, carmina Cæsar*
Sitne tibi? Must the Princely Monarke of *Great Brittaine* patronize a Section, containing nothing but a contradictiõ? Must human Maiesty countenance sacriledge against Diuine humanity? *Absit*: Be it farre from him.

Non vacat sacrilegis rebus adesse Ioui.

And therefore, Mr. *Brereley*, you must be pleased, either to recall your opinion, or change your Dedication: For our religious *Salomon*, by his Princely Pen, hath giuen you sufficient testimony, that he did neuer yet finde *Austine* to be the Author of any such assertion; That Christs naturall body could bee on earth without circumscription.

Which

Which is as much as to say, that Christs body could be no body, or at least but a phantasticall body; which was the heresie of *Manicheus* and *Valentinus*. For it is a contradiction to say, That this is a true body, and that it hath no dimensions; *omne corpus* being *quantum*, and euery quantity hath dimensions of necessity; extention beeing the *ratio formalis* of quantity: So that he that will abstract extention and dimensions from a true body, must needs (by some pretty Anatomicall alcumy) abstract it from it owne beeing; which is impossible.

Lege Aug. epist. 57. ad Vard. & 99. ad Euod. Hieron. in psal. 119. Ambros. in Luca.

And heere I must confesse my selfe vnwilling to enter into any disputation about Gods omnipotency, what hee can doe; it is peculiar to the Iesuites in most of their discourses, both in Philosophy and Diuinity; let them answer it: Yet this I may say safely; That God will neuer make contradictions to be *simul vera*; true at one and the same time. So that in some sense it may bee said, That Christ could not make his naturall body to be without circumscription, as S. *Austin* speakes in his Booke *cont. Maxim.* And the Master of the Sentences makes it plaine, how Christ may be said *non habere potentiam gignere filium*: not to haue power to beget a Sonne. Neither doth this proceede *ab impotentia*, from want of any power or ability, *sed ab inconuenientia*, from an inconuenience; and so it is in the other. Thus you see, by taking away circumscription, you destroy the naturall body of Christ: and because you bring nothing at all out of *Austin*, to proue that Christs body can be without circumscriptiõ, I haue noted one or two, to proue that it cannot. *In loco est, & de loco migrat; & cùm ad alium locum venerit, in eo loco vnde venit non est*: It is in a place, and moues from a place (speaking of the naturall body of Christ) and when it comes to another place, it is not in that place from whence it came. Which necessarily implies a circumscription and a limitation to these two indiuiduall conditions, *hic & nunc*, and plainely ouerthrowes your doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Lumb. lib. 1. sent. dist. 7.

Tom. 9. tract. 31. in Joh.

Tom. 6. lib 20. con. Faust. Man. cap. 11.

To those two reasons which you alledge out of Saint

Austin, I answer, First, that Christ was borne without interruption of the Virginall parts: which if you vnderstand to be without any dilatation or opening of the Virgins wombe at all, it is most false, as both *Hierome* and *Durand* affirme: but if you vnderstand it to be without griefe or losse of virginity, I grant it to be Saint *Austins* tenent: his words are these: *Sicut in vtero non est maculata Christi maiestas, sic in transitu non est corrupta Mariæ virginitas*: Euen as the maiesty of Christ was nothing stained in the wombe, so the Virginity of *Mary* was nothing at all blemished by the passage of Christ out of the wombe into the world. And a little after: *Nec in concipiendo libidinem, nec in pariendo passa est dolorem*: *Mary* was neither tainted with lust in conceiuing, nor with griefe in bringing foorth our Sauiour. So that the wombe of the Virgin was opened without paine, that the body of Christ might haue passage, and returned againe without losse of virginity: onely, Mr. *Brereley*, you shew your little skill in Logicke, in bringing from so plaine premises, such an obscure *Ergo*, Christs body may be without circumscription: For the wombe of the Virgin gaue way to the body of Christ, and clozed againe. But I know, Mr. *Brereley*, that by reason of your vowed chastity, you are vnacquainted with these matters, and therefore desire to heare no more of such secrets: my sworne modesty iumps with your vowed chastity, and bids me speake no more: I haue done.

Your second reason is, Because hee passed in vnto his Disciples, the doore beeing shut; *ergò* his body may bee without circumscription. *Negatur sequi*: For first, it was a miracle, whereby Christ shewed to his Disciples the power of his Diuinity; either by opening and shutting immediately the doore, or by causing it to giue way to him (as the wombe of the Virgin did in his birth) and instantly, *in minimo tempore*, in the least time, without noyse to returne to its place againe: all which may be done, without robbing the body of Christ of its quantity, and so making it no body.

Chrysostome fals into admiration at these two actions:

Ego

Ego hoc miror (saith he) *quomodò de virgine virgo natus sit, & tamen virginis mater sit virgo; vultis scire quomodo? Clausa erant ostia, & ingressus est Iesus; hoc datis potentiæ Dei; date etiam Dei potentiæ quod de virgine natus sit, & ipsa post partum fuerit virgo:* I wonder how a maid could be borne of a maid, and yet the mother remaine a maid. Will you know how? The dores were shut, and Iesus entred: attribute this to the power of God, &c. And *Hierome* thought, that by his diuine power he made the doore giue way to his body. *Quid magnum est,* (saith he) *creaturam cedere Creatori?* What great thing is it for a creature to giue way to the Creator? And Saint *Austin*, by your owne confession, thought it to be a miracle: *Hic si ratio quæritur, non erit mirabile:* If any demand a reason, it were not a miracle; many places might haue beene vrged out of *Austin* to this purpose; but because you content your selfe with so few, and those nothing at all (as you see) against the Church of *England*, I am satisfied. Onely I must heere giue the Reader to vnderstand, what he cannot chuse but perceiue by perusing what is written; That yet I find no difference in Religion betweene Saint *Austin* and the Church of *England*. And as for you (Mr. *Brereley*) seeing one Countrey hath either bredor fed vs both, let vs ioyne hands with all humility, and pray to Him, (concerning whose Body we haue disputed) that he would in mercy open vnto vs the Doore of Heauen, and cloathe vs with the long white robes of his glorious righteousnesse, (which is a most blessed circumscription;) when mortality shall be swallowed vp by Eternity; when opinion, with time, shall cease, and the truth of these hidden mysteries shall be reueiled.

Hom. de Ioh. Baptist.

Hierom. aduers. error. Ioh. Ierosol.

Tom. 2. epist. 3. ad Volusia.

Sect. 9.

Whether doth Saint Avstin *teach, that the bleſſed Virgin* Mary *was conceiued without originall ſinne?*

Tom.8.enarr.in Pſal.34.con.2.

ADAM mortuus eſt propter peccatum; Maria, ex Adam, mortua eſt propter peccatum Adæ; & caro Domini ex Maria, mortua eſt propter delenda peccata: Adam dyed by reaſon of ſinne; *Mary*, the daughter of *Adam*, dyed for the ſinne of *Adam*; and the fleſh of our Lord taken from *Mary*, dyed to blot out ſinnes, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. Which were ſufficient, if I ſhould ſay no more, to confute all that nothing, which Maſter *Brereley* brings out of *Auſtin*, for the defence of his opinion: who would beare vs in hand, that the bleſſed Virgins freedome from originall ſin, were *Auſtins* Religion; and yet is not able to alledge one place out of *Auſtin* to proue it.

Mart.

Non potuit melius litem finire iocoſam.

Modeſty (belike) forbade him to lye in *Engliſh*, leſt euery common Artificer ſhould take him tripping; when as the good Father neuer once dreamed of ſo groſſe a Hereſie, as to free a creature from the conditions of mortality. Reade but his 157. *Epiſt. de animarum origine ad Optatum*, and I will referre my ſelfe to your owne iudgement. *Neminem naſci ex Adam, niſi vinculo damnationis obſtrictum, &c.* None euer was borne of *Adam*, but tyed in the bands of damnation, &c. And a little after: *Neceſſe eſt eſſe in omnibus paruulis*: It muſt needs bee in all little ones; neuer excepting the bleſſed Virgin, but further confirmes his opinion *ex epiſt. Papæ Zozimi: In omni ſexu, ætate, conditione generis humani, eandem plenitudinem tenet baptiſmus*: In euery age, in euery condition of mankind, in euery ſexe, baptiſme hath the ſame force. Which (ſaith he) is to purge and really to waſh vs from the pollution of original ſinne; *in quo nullus natorum non tenetur obnoxius*: from which none borne of *Adam* is free; excepting only the Mediator, who was begot without the helpe of man: ſo that if the Virgin

Lege Aug. lib.1. Retract. cap.9. lib.1.confeſſ.c.7.

Mary

Mary had beene begot *ſine viri ſemine*, without mans ſeede, ſhe might haue been free from originall ſin; but beeauſe ſhe was not, therfore ſhe could not be born free from that innate pollution which neceſſarily followes euery phyſicall generation. And moſt of your beſt Writers doe agree with Saint *Auſtin* in this poſition: *Transfunditur originale peccatum ex illis qui generant ex coitu, etiam in Mariam*: Originall ſinne is tranſferred vpon vs, from thoſe that beget vs by copulation, euen vpon the bleſſed Virgin Mary: ſaith *Bonauenture*. And *Lombard*, one of your chiefe Schoole-doctors, ſayes, That ſhee was not borne free from originall ſinne, but made free by the working of the holy Ghoſt, when the Babe beganne to ſpring in her wombe. With him agrees *Aquinas*, That originall ſin did remaine in her, *quoad eſſentiam*, though not *quoad exercitiũ*; his words are very plaine; Though (ſaith he) the contrary poſition doth ſeeme to belong to the dignity of the mother Virgin, yet it derogates frõ the dignity of the Son Virgin: and it is ſo doubtfull in the Church of Rome at this day, that *Bellarmine* dares not determine it: and ſo hath remained, euer ſince that bluſtering was made betweene the two ſorts of begging Friars, the Minorites and the Dominicans. With the firſt ſort ioyned *Sixtus* 4. who with the thundering noyſe of his roaring Bulls, ſuppreſſed all oppoſers; ſo that the poore Dominicans, hauing on their ſide foure famous Teachers, *Lombard*, *Aquinas*, *Bonauenture*, and *Veritas*, yet could not be heard. So Mr. *Brereley*, you ſee heere, oppoſeth himſelfe againſt the Maſter of the Sentences, *Bonauent*. *Aquin*. *Bern*. and *Bellarm*. vrged therevnto by one bare confeſsion of the *Centuriſts* concerning S. *Auſtin*: and though Mr. *Brereley* name not the place in *Auſtin*, yet Ile doe him that fauour to cite it for him. It is in *Tom*. 7. *lib*. *de natura & grat*. *c*. 36. *Excepta ſancta virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini, nullam prorſus, cùm de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quæſtionem*: Excepting only the holy Virgin *Mary*, concerning whom, for the honour of my Lord, I would haue no queſtion, when we entreat of ſinnes. *Ergò*, ſhee was free from originall ſinne.

Hieron. Zanch. lib. 1. de peccat. origin. c. 4.

Bonauent. in 3. lib. ſent. diſt. 3. q. 1

Aquin. Sum part. 3. q. 37. art. 3.

Bell. lib. 3. de cult. ſanct. c. 16.

Lege Baſill. pag. 233. Epiſt. Leonis 91. Tertul. de præſ. aduerſ. hæret. Paulum Corteſ. in Lumb. ad Iulium Papam. Caietanum tom. 2. tract. 1. de concept. virg.

Greg. Arimin. lib. 2. diſtinct. 30. q. 2. art. 1.

ſinne. This is a waighty concluſion, and more (I am ſure) then the premiſes are able to beare: becauſe Saint *Auſtin* in that place ſets downe nothing poſitiuely, but by way of negation. When we entreat of ſin, I would haue no queſtion made of the Mother (ſaith *Auſtin*) for the honour I beare to her Sonne. And who would thinke, that out of ſo ſweet a place, any could gather ſo infectious a poſition; Therefore ſhe was free from originall ſinne? Yet ſuppoſe it be poſitiue, it ſerues nothing at all for your purpoſe (as you might eaſily haue gathered, if you had read the place your ſelfe) becauſe *Auſtin* ſpeakes there of actuall, not originall ſin; bringing in for example other religious Women (*Anna, altera Maria, & Elizabetha,*) as being free from the ſame ſins that bleſſed *Mary* was; & yet you neuer thought that *Auſtin* held them to be free from originall ſinne: and that's the reaſon why *Lumbard* puts in this limitation: (*Ex tunc ab omni peccato immunis*) from the conception ſhe was free, but not before. How, and when ſhe was freed from the guilt of originall ſinne, and what inclination ſhe had to actuall ſinne, is another queſtion: Sufficient it is for any Chriſtian to beleeue, that the bleſſed Virgin (as wel as the reſt of *Adams* poſterity) was conceiued in originall ſinne. This is Saint *Auſtins* Religion, vpheld by the cheifeſt pillars of the Romane Church, and profeſt at this day in the Church of *England*.

lib. 3. ſentent. diſt. 3.

Lumb. Aquin. Bern. Bell.

Sect. 10.

Whether doth Saint Avstin *teach, that the body of the bleſſed Virgin was aſſumed into heauen?*

COncerning the aſſumption of the bleſſed Virgin, it is true, that the Centuriſts haue ſet downe ſuch a Booke, *de aſſumptione Virginis Mariæ*: of the aſſumption of the bleſſed Virgin: whether the originall be corrupted or no, I know not:) and doe ſhew that it hath bin aſcribed to Saint *Auſtin*; but with what verity, let

an

an impartiall Reader iudge. *Eraſmus* prefixes this cenſure in the fore-front of it: *Hunc tractatum ne pilum habere Auguſtini:* this Tract ſauours nothing of Saint *Auſtin*, but was incerted by ſome one, deſirous to vphold the bleſſed Virgin in her aſſenſion, leſt ſhe ſhould fall downe, and ſo become ſubiect to corruption. *Baronius* and *Stapleton* both hold, that *Auſtin* is not the Author of it: and *Bellarmine* leaues it among the bookes that are doubtfully aſcribed to Saint *Auſtin*: but indeed it is not doubtfull; for there is not a ſentence in it that ſauours of Saint *Auſtins* ſtile, and therefore it cannot ſhew what *Auſtins* opinion was. In that Sermon attributed to S. *Hierome*, though it be none of his, yet nothing can be proued from it, but ſome hiſtoricall relations without ground, and ſome other ſuppoſitiue vncertaineties, which ſerue nothing at all to proue it to bee *Auſtins* opinion. What *Andreas Cretenſis* and *Gregory* haue writ concerning this point, is not materiall, ſince *Auſtins* Religion cannot be prooued but from his owne Workes; and therefore at this time I'le paſſe them ouer. Now, in that you take ſo great paines to proue a matter of no great moment, you ſhew to the world that indiſcreet zeale which you alwaies vſe, to extoll mortall creatures aboue that which is meet: as I heare you haue dealt with thoſe, to whom, a ſudden-falling Roome brought lately a fearefull and vnexpected death. We ſay it was a Iudgement; if *Auſtin* were aliue, hee would ſay no leſſe: but you gather from it an argument of their pietie; The falling houſe muſt proue them Saints: For,

Baron. Tom. 1. Annal. *Staplet. prompt. cathol. part. 1.*

Stantia non poterant tecta probare bonos. *Mart.*

So in this action of the Virgins aſſumption, you ſay it is neceſſary to be beleeued. The Truth ſayes, No. *Vtri creditis, Chriſtiani?* Neither doth the part affirmatiue any thing more honour her by affirming, nor the negatiue part derogate any thing at all from her dignity by denying it: for a glorious Saint in heauen may haue a body entombed in a clod of earth: onely we deſire to confirme our beliefe according to the will of God; *ad voluntatem ſigni*; to his reueiled will. Now it is certaine that God hath not reueiled

ueiled it in his Word, that her body ſhould be taken vp into heauen before the generall Reſurrection; and therefore in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, it is preſumption in any man to determine it. *Vbi res naturaliter obſcura, & apertè diuina Scriptura non ſubuenit, temerè præſumit humana coniectura, aliquid definire:* Where the matter is naturally obſcure, and the diuine Scripture doth not plainely helpe vs, there men doe raſhly preſume to define any thing. So that moſt of your owne Writers doe not ſo much as once name the aſſumption of *Mary* in all their workes; ſuppoſing ſilence to be the beſt Rhetorick in handling ſo dangerous a Theame: and Saint *Auſtin*, you ſee, has not a word concerning this ſubiect; nor the Church of *England*.

Tom. 2. ep. 157. de anim. orig.

Sect. II.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the bleſſed Virgin was tyed to perpetuall chaſtity by a ſolemne vow?*

Saint *Auſtin* (you ſay) teaches, that the Virgin *Mary* vowed perpetuall chaſtity. But here you muſt grant me a common courteſie, (any opponent will grant it to his reſpondent) to ſalute you with a *Quomodò probas?* You reply, that it is euident *ex Tom. 6. lib. de ſanct. virg. c. 4.* (it is cited by *Bellarmine*, in whoſe ſteps you tread ſo directly, that if you were both on one Theater, I ſhould iudge you linkt together.) The words of *Auſtin* are theſe: *Quod profectò non diceret, niſi Deo virginem ſe ante vouiſſet, &c.* To which place I anſwere, That there is a twofold vow: the firſt is *votum commune*, which euery Chriſtian makes in baptiſme: The ſecond is *votum ſingulare*, which is alſo twofold; the firſt is ſolemne, which is called alſo by the Schoole-men, *Votum publicum*, a publique vow: when any bind themſelues ſolemnly, and in publique, before the Church: The ſecond is *ſimplex*, a ſimple vow, which is either *prolatum*, when any one formally vſing a ſet forme of words, priuately binds himſelfe to chaſtity:

Lege lib. 2. de Monach. cap. 22.

Nature

or *tacitum*; and that is nothing elſe but a firme purpoſe and reſolution to remaine in ſuch a ſtate of life, till God and Nature change that determination; and ſo bleſſed *Mary* vowed chaſtity: (i.) *velle tate ſine deſiderio*: in will or deſire: ſhe had a firme reſolution to remaine a Virgin, without either a ſolemne or formall vow at all. Thus did *Lumbard* vnderſtand Saint *Auſtin*, and the place by you cited; *Quomodò fiet iſtud, quoniam virum non cognoſco? (id eſt) me non cogniturum propoſui: propoſuerat enim Maria in virginitate manere, niſi Deus aliter facere inberet*: How ſhall that bee, ſeeing I know not a man? (that is) ſeeing I haue purpoſed not to know any man? for bleſſed *Mary* did reſolue and purpoſe to remaine a Virgin, vnleſſe God ſhould command her to doe otherwiſe. Where you haue the very ſame diſtinction. So ſaith *Auſtin*, That ſhee had vowed chaſtity, (i.) ſhe had made a firme reſolution and purpoſe to preſerue her Virginity from all men (*ſic dicitur Deo dicata*) till the conſummation of marriage. Againe, ſhe had vow'd in her heart to God, that ſhe was a pure Maid in the preſent, (which is neceſſarily to be beleeued) without any ſolemne or formall binding of her ſelfe to preſerue her virginity for the time to come. *Suarez* confeſſeth thus much, almoſt in the ſame words: *Deus Mariam elegit, non quia virgo futura, ſed potiùs vt eſſet virgo in præſenti*: God choſe *Mary*, not becauſe ſhe ſhould be a virgin for all time to come, but rather becauſe ſhee was a Maide in the preſent. And ſo euery true Chriſtian Woman ought to vow; that is, firmely to purpoſe, & vpon ſet reſolution to determine, to preſerue her virginity, till the Lawes of God and man command the contrary.

Lib. 4 ſent. diſt. 28. parte 2 li.

Tom. 1. in 3. part. Aquin. q. 2. art. 12. ſect. 8.

Againe, your owne *Aquinas* grants, that there was a true marriage betweene *Joſeph* and *Mary*; *Et votum caſtitatis ſolemne repugnat cùm vero matrimonio*: A ſolemne vow of chaſtity cannot conſiſt with true marriage, as both *Lumbard* and *Suarez* teſtifie; and therefore by your owne tenent, ſhe was not bound to perpetuall chaſtity by any ſolemne vow. Whether it be lawfull or no to vow chaſtity, I haue ſet downe both Saint *Auſtins* and mine owne opinion

Sum. part. 3. q. 29.

Lib. 4 ſent diſt. 38.

Suar. tom. 2. in 3. part. Aquin. q. 29. art. 2. ſect. 1

opinion in another place. This that hath beene ſpoken, is ſufficient to demonſtrate vnto you, that this (*vouiſſet*) in Saint *Auſtins* language, is not correſpondent to that vow which your degenerating Monks haue lately begot, ſince *Auſtins* time; and is dayly foſtered by Ieſuites, grazing in the wanton meades of *Babylon*. Could it be proued vnto me by any one endowed with ſound iudgement and ſobriety, (with wrangling Sophiſters I haue vowed neuer to meddle) that Saint *Auſtins* meaning were otherwiſe, I ſhould willingly condiſcend, ſince I neuer bound my ſelfe *ad verba Magiſtri*, further then Truth would giue her word for payment. Neither am I ignorant, that many iudicious Diuines haue cenſured Saint *Auſtin* for the contrary opinion, whoſe Workes muſt anſwere for themſelues without an Aduocate. I neuer vndertooke to rectifie, vindicate, or maintaine euery priuate mans opinion; I only haue peruſed S. *Auſtins* Workes, and, by comparing one place with another, by conſidering things going before, and things following, with other circumſtances of time, place, and perſon againſt whom he writ, haue drawn out his Religion into certaine concluſions, whereof this is one: *That the bleſſed Virgin was not bound to perpetuall chaſtity by any ſolemne Vow*. And till you can proue the contrary out of *Auſtin* himſelfe, you muſt giue me leaue (without an obligation) to hold this one opinion, not contradicted by Saint *Auſtin*, nor the Church of England.

P. Mart. lib. de vot. & cœlib. Chemnit. exam. conc. Trid. D. Willet ſyn. pap.

SECT. 12.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that there are diuers degrees and orders of Angels?*

Aug. lib. 5. cont. Iulianum Pelag. cap. 3.

QVid autem ſit verum libentiùs diſco quàm dico, ne audeam docere quod neſcio: The truth of this queſtion I would rather learne then ſpeake, leſt I ſhould be thought ouer-bold, in teaching what I know not: but becauſe you haue moued the queſtion, you ſhall alſo perceiue,

ceiue, that about it, there is no difference between S. *Auſtin* and the Church of England. That there are diuers degrees of Angels, *Auſtine* is very plaine: *Nullus inferior ſuperiori inuidebit, vt etiam iam Archangelis non inuident cæteri Angeli, &c.* No inferiour enuies his ſuperiour, euen as other Angels doe not enuy the Archangels. From whence you collect (but not againſt the Church of *England*) That there are diſtinct orders of Angels: for we willingly grant as much as any Scholler in the world can gather by direct conſequence, from that place of *Auſtin* (i.) that there are ſuperiours and inferiours, Angels and Archangels, by office, not by creation, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes: So that one and the ſame Angell may be ſucceſsiuely both an inferiour and a ſuperiour, *adſtans vel miniſtrans*, as their Creator ſhall appoint. But that there ſhould bee nine diſtinct degrees of them by creation, without poſſibility of changing their order; ſo that *adſtantes* might not be *miniſtrantes*, nor *miniſtrantes adſtantes*, as ſome of you (ouer-impudently-audacious priers into Gods vnreueiled ſecrets) haue determined, *Auſtin* durſt neuer define. Neither doth Mr. *Caluin* abſolutely deny the diſtinct degrees of Angels, but onely bids vs beware vpon what ground we build our opinions: ſo dangerous he thought it for mortality to ſpeake, where the neuer-erring Oracle of Heauen is ſilent.

Tom. 5. lib. 22. de Ciuit. Dei cap. vlt. Well it were, if the Angels of the Church Militant did ſo

Angelus, officij nomen non naturæ. tom. 6. operum tract. vlt.

Lib. 1. Inſtit. cap. 14.

It is true that *Chemnitius* alledges Saint *Auſtin* to this purpoſe; but you might better haue paſt ouer that place in ſilence; which I thinke you would, had you read it in Saint *Auſtin* your ſelfe, becauſe it directly contradicts the doctrine now taught in the Church of *Rome*, concerning the point in hand. *Sunt quidem* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) *throni, dominationes, principatus, & poteſtates: ſed quid inter ſe quatuor illa vocabula diſtent, qui poſſunt, dicant, ſi tamen poſſunt probare quid dicunt: Ego me iſta ignorare confiteor.* There are Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and powers; but how thoſe foure words differ among themſelues, let them ſhew that can, if they can proue what they ſay: For I confeſſe, I know not. He grants there are degrees and orders of Angels, but how they differ, he knowes not. Now all

that you labour to proue in this point, is, That there ſhould be a ſet difference and known diſtinction in the degrees of Angels; which *Auſtin* denyes; & yet all your Ieſuites ſtoutly affirme it, as though they had once been Angels, and for their prying pride throwne downe from Heauen, to diſturbe the earth. Thus you ſee what Saint *Auſtins* Religion was concerning this queſtion. For the conſent of the Church of *England* with the Father, Ile briefely ſhut it vp in theſe concluſions. Firſt, That all the Angels are equall by creation, *Hoc commune & æquale habebant, quod ſpiritus erant*: ſaith *Lumbard*: though they might differ in quickneſſe of vnderſtanding and freedome of will. Secondly, That Angels haue diſtinct offices; and ſo they may bee ſaid to be placed in diſtinct rancks, by miniſtration, not creation; which offices are not perpetuall, but mutable, to bee applyed to this or that Angell, according to Gods good pleaſure: ſo that one and the ſame may be an Angell and an Archangell at diuers times; they hauing theſe names, *non eſſendo, ſed obediendo*: not by their eſſence, but by their office and obedience. Thirdly, it may be granted as probable, that they differ in ſituation & in the degrees of illumination. Laſtly, To determine and ſet downe the ſeuerall celeſtiall Hirarchies and degrees of Angels, is more then any man can doe; and therefore to goe about it, muſt needs be preſumptuous and dangerous curioſity. *Ego me iſta ignorare confiteor*: I confeſſe I knowe them not (ſaith Saint *Auſtin.*) Which you will not yeeld vnto, onely leſt you ſhould bee thought to haue defended an errour, which would diſcourage your followers: like vnto the *Donatiſts*, who would not yeeld to Saint *Auſtin* teaching the truth, *ne erraſſe videantur*, leſt they ſhould be thought to haue erred. Neither doe thoſe Authors which haue writ of it, agree in their poſitions; The *Platoniſts* held, there were three orders onely: your faigned *Dionyſius* (vnknowne to Saint *Auſtin*) holds there are nine orders, and three Hirarchies.

Tom. 3. ench. ad Laurent. c. 29. & Tom. 6 lib. cont. priſc. & Orig. c. 11.

Lib. 2. ſent. diſt. 3.

Aug. tom. 6. op. ſerm. 11.

These words cannot miſbecome a Ieſuites mouth.

**Damaſ. lib. 2. de fid. orthod. c. de Angel. Athanaſ. lib. de communi eſſent. Pat. Fil. & Sp. ſ. Greg. hom. 34. in Euang. Hieron. Zanch. de ord. Angel. c. 14.*

Diuers others there are, * which any one may reade, that delights to ſpend precious time to no good purpoſe; but

but let mee ſaue thee that labour (induſtrious Student) whoſoeuer thou art; for, the more thou readeſt of it, the further thou ſhalt perceiue thy ſelfe entred into a Labeynthian Maze of ſtrong vncertainties: and therefore our Maſter *Ariſtotle*, contenting himſelfe with ſo many Angels as were ſufficient to moue the celeſtiall ſpheres, is to be preferred before *Dionyſius*, *Clictoueus*, & other Schoolemen, who were neuer wrapt into any of the Heauens, and yet their vnlimited curioſitie hath brought them diſtinctly to determine (as though they had been in that new City, and had ſeene and marked the inuiolable orders and degrees of thoſe glorious Courtiers) that which God neuer reueiled. So that what *Origen* writ againſt *Celſus*, calling his opinions *monſtroſa phantaſmata*, monſtrous conceits, I may more truely take vp againſt thoſe that patronize this vnknowne Hierarchie; their opinions can be nothing but conceits, and therefore dangerous, if not altogether contrary to ſound Diuinity: *Auſtin* alone holds not this curious knowledge to bee dangerous; before him, *Irenæus* held it; *Nazianzene De natura Angelorum*; and diuers others, whoſe names you are not ignorant of: Thus briefly you ſee what *Auſtins* Religion is concerning this controuerſie, and how it is agreeable to that, which is maintained at this day in the Church of England. Either make mee vnderſtand a more manifeſt truth, or elſe bluſh not (louing Countriman) to ſing a *palinodiam*, remembring Saint *Auſtins* modeſty, *Non erubeſcendum eſt homini, confiteri ſe neſcire quod neſcit, ne dum ſe ſcire mentitur, nunquam ſcire mereatur*: A man needes not bluſh to confeſſe himſelfe to be ignorant of that which hee knowes not, leſt while he belyes himſelfe, in ſaying hee knowes, hee neuer deſerue to come to the knowledge of it. So that hereafter wee may ioyntly behold the truth of this hidden myſtery, and be made partakers of their glory in ſome degree.

Lib. 2. c. 55.

Tom. 2. Epiſt. 157.

Chap. III. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the holy Scriptures are to be acknowledged for ſuch, onely by the authority of the Church?*

Saint *Auſtin* conſiders man in a two-fold eſtate. 1. *in ſtatu corruptionis*, in the ſtate of corruption: and ſo the authority of the Church makes man firſt acknowledge Scripture to be Scripture; as it did *Auſtin*, beeing a Manichee; which authority is onely directiue in propoſing, but the Scripture in it ſelfe hath the authority coactiue in determining. 2. *in ſtatu conuerſionis*, in the ſtate of conuerſion, hauing faith; and ſo the authority of the Church is only the *mediũ per quod*, the means by which, and not the *argumentũ propter quod credimus*, not the argument for which wee beleeue; the Church muſt of neceſsity propoſe things credible, but the Scripture it ſelfe conuinces, and is the laſt reſolution of faith: Man conſidered in the firſt ſtate, acknowledges Scripture to be Scripture, by the directiue authoritie of the Churches propoſition; in the ſecond ſtate, by the authoritie of Chriſt, ſpeaking in the Scripture: *mihi autem certum eſt, nuſquàm prorſus à Chriſti authoritate diſcedere, non enim reperio valentiorem*: I am reſolued neuer to depart from the authority of Chriſt, for I cannot finde any ſtronger, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. No authoritie of the Church is to be preferred before the authority of Chriſt ſpeaking in his word. *Eccleſia non debet ſe Chriſto præponere, quia ille ſemper veraciter iudicat, homines plerunque falluntur*: the Church ought not to preferre her ſelfe before Chriſt, becauſe he euer iudges truely, when as men oftentimes are deceiued, ſaith *Auſtine*, Chriſt euer iudges true, but the Church may erre; ſo that euery true beleeuer ought

Lib. 3. cont. Acad. c. 20.

Lib. 2. cont. Creſcon. gram. c. 21.

ought to acknowledge Scripture to be Scripture for it owne authoritie. But Maſter *Brereley* hath taken ſome paines to proue the contrary (endeuouring to make Saint *Auſtin* contradict himſelfe out of himſelfe,) the words are theſe: *Si ergò inuenires aliquem qui Euangelio nondum credit, quid faceres dicenti tibi, Non credo? ego verò Euangelio non crederem, niſi me Eccleſia catholica commoueret authoritas*: If you finde one which doth not beleeue the Goſpell, what would you doe to ſuch a one as ſayes to you, I doe not beleeue? I would not haue beleeued the Goſpell, had not the authoritie of the Catholique Church moued mee. Which words were ſpoken by *Auſtin* in the ſecond ſtate, but with reference to the firſt; neither doe any words before or after conteſt the contrary; ſo that the words containe within themſelues a plaine anſwere, as being ſpoken, not of them which beleeue already, but of thoſe which are not as yet conuerted: for ſuppoſe you finde one (ſaith *Auſtin*) that doth not yet beleeue the Goſpell, ſuch a one as I my ſelfe was, being a Manichee, *Quid faceres dicenti, Non credo?* Tis true: with ſuch, the authority of the Church doth moſt preuaile, as it did with *Auſtin* before hee beleeued the Goſpell; but beeing conuerted (if the Church did determine any thing contrary to the written Word) he would not depart from the authoritie of Chriſt: and that this is the true ſence and meaning of *Auſtin* in the place by you cited, it is moſt euident: for hee ſayes not, *Ego Euangelio non credam, nec credam*, without the authority of the Church, implying eyther the preſent or the future time; but (*Non crederem*) hauing reſpect to the time paſt: tying theſe together, *Qui Euangelio nondum credit*, and, *Ego non crederem*: When I was *non credens*, before I beleeued the Goſpell, the authoritie of the Catholique Church did preuaile with mee, as being the ſtrongeſt motiue I ſaw to draw mee: but now I beleeue in Chriſt for his owne authoritie, *et non reperio valentiorem*, and I finde no ſtronger: neither doth hee in any thing derogate from the dignitie of the Church, by attributing the chiefe authoritie to Chriſt, holding the Church

Tom.6.lib.cont. Epiſt. Manich. c.5.

Lege Auguſt. tract.2.in ep.Ioh. Lib.de Vnitat. Eccleſ.c.10. Lib.2.de nupt. et concupiſ.c.33. Serm.29.de verbis Dom. Epiſt.19.ad Hieron. Epiſt.48.ad Vincent. Lege Irenæũ lib. 3.aduerſ.hæreſ. c.11. Epiſt.Athanaſ.ad Epiſtet.Hilar. lib.7.de trinit.

to

to be the argument in the action of conuerſion; but afterwards to be the meanes onely to keepe thoſe that are conuerted in the faith; who doe beleeue, *perEccleſiam*, by the Church, but not onely *propter Eccleſiam*, for the Church. And to this interpretation of Saint *Auſtin*, any indifferent Reader will affixe his approbation, as beeing plaine and euident.

Ambroſ. lib. 1. de fide ad Gratian. Chryſoſt. hom. 33. in act. Apoſt. Baſil. moral. 26. c. 1.

In what manner *Bachmannus* and *Suinglius* haue cenſured this Father, it is not materiall for mee to recite, ſeeing it was neuer my purpoſe to free him (*verbatim*) from all the harſh cenſures vndeſeruedly caſt vpon him: the plaine-ſpeaking truth is beſt able to wipe off all aſperſions. It ſhall be ſufficient for this time (all the teſtimonies of theſe Ancients omitted, to which I referre the Reader) to proue what I haue ſaid out of *Auſtin* himſelfe; *Perſuaſiſti mihi non qui crederent libris tuis, ſed qui non crederent eſſe culpandos, &c. ſi quis fortè mihi diceret, Undè ſcis illos libros? idipſum maximè credendum erat*: Thou haſt perſwaded mee, that not thoſe which beleeue, but thoſe which beleeue not, ſhall be blamed: if any ſay vnto mee, How knoweſt thou thoſe bookes? that is chiefly to be beleeued. Thou (Lord) haſt perſwaded me to beleeue, what the authority of the Church did onely moue vnto; if any one aske mee, how I know Scripture to be Scripture? *Hoc credendum potiùs quàm demonſtrandum*: Faith is better than any demonſtration. God vſes for our conuerſion the externall miniſtery of the Church, but he cauſes vs to beleeue his Word, *intùs per ſua gratia vnctionem*, by the inward working of his grace, ſaith *Stapleton*: which was Saint *Auſtins* Religion, and is the Religion now taught in the Church of *England*.

Bonauent. in breuilog. part. 5. c. 7. Mantuan. Bapt. lib. 3. de patient. c. 32. Geiſ. de vita ſpirit. anim. Card. Caictan. comment. in 1. ad corr. 12. Auſt. lib. 6. conf. c. 5. Lib. defenſ. auth. Eccleſ.

Sect. 2.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Austin *teach, that the Bookes of* Tobie, Iudith, *and* Macchabees, *&c. are Canonicall Scriptures?*

Legimus in actibus Apostolorum, dictum de quibusdam credentibus, quòd quotidiè scrutarentur Scripturas. Quas itaque Scripturas, nisi canonicas. Legis & Prophetarũ? Huc accesserunt Euangelia, Apostolica Epistola, actus Apostolorum, Apocalypsis Iohannis: scrutamini hæc omnia: We reade in the Acts of the Apostles, that it is said of some beleeuers, that they daily searcht the Scriptures: which Scriptures, but the Canonicall Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets? To these are added the Gospels, the Epistles Apostolicall, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Reuelation of *Iohn:* search all these (saith *Austin.*) Search all these, for these are truely canonicall. From whence it may bee concluded, that Saint *Austin* admits no Bookes in the old Testament for truely canonicall, except the Law and the Prophets: but the Bookes in controuersie, are not contained vnder the Law nor the Prophets, therefore in *Austins* iudgement they are not truely canonicall: for they are giuen to vs to be read *non cum credendi necessitate, sed cum iudicandi libertate*; not with a necessitie of beleeuing euery thing they containe, but with the liberty of iudging of them, as Saint *Austin* speakes. And yet Master *Brereley* holds them for canonicall, and seemes to proue it out of Saint *Austin*; the words are these: *Quorum supputatio temporum non in Scripturis sanctis quæ canonicæ appellantur, sed in alijs inuenitur, in quibus sunt & Macchabæorum libri, quos non Iudæi, sed Ecclesia pro canonicis habet, propter quorundam Martyrum passiones, &c.* The computation of which times is not to bee found in the holy Scriptures, which are called canonicall, but in other bookes, amongst whom

Aug. Tom. 7. lib. de vnitat. Eccles. cap. 16.

Tom. 6. lib. 11. cont. Faust. Manich. cap. 5.

Tom. 5. lib. 18. de Ciuit. Dei. c. 36. Iosephus fuit Macchab. Script. teste Hieron. ad-uers. Pelag.

whom are the Bookes of Macchabees: which not the Iewes, but the Church hath for canonicall, for the ſufferings of certaine Martyrs. Mee thinkes (Maſter *Brereley*) you ſhould be willing to re-call this quotation: I am ſure, euery iudicious Papiſt, in reading it, will bluſh for ſhame. Adde then (iudicious Aduerſary) to thy bluſhing, mourning, That *Rome* hauing loſt her beſt Fauourites, hath none to ſpeake for her now, but ſuch as cannot ſpeake. God is my witneſſe, I was euer willing (though ſometimes drawne aſide by vnruly paſsions, and worſe perſwaſions from the weaker Sex) to conſent to the truth where-euer I found it, without reſpect to time or perſon; and had beene a member of that Church, had I not read their Authors, ſo weakly and abſurdly diſputing to maintaine the ſame. That thou maiſt perceiue this to be true, Ile leade thee no further (courteous Reader) than to this argument in hand; Maſter *Brereley* ſayes, that *Auſtin* holds the Booke of Macchabees for canonicall Scripture, and proues it from the place before cited; where thou maiſt reade theſe words: *Non in Scripturis ſanctis quæ canonicæ appellantur, ſed in alijs inuenitur, in quibus ſunt Macchabæorum libri, &c.* It is not to be found in the holy Scriptures, which are called Canonicall, but in other Bookes, as in the booke of Macchabees. Where Saint *Auſtin* makes a plaine diſtinction betweene the canonicall Scripture and the Booke of Macchabees. Hee that ſees not this truth, cannot impute any fault to his vnderſtanding, but to his will, obiecting this to his knowledge (*Durum eſt, parentum traditiones relinquere*; It is hard for vs to leaue the traditions of our Fathers; they receiued them for truely canonicall, and ſo muſt wee. Now to the latter part of the Text: (*Quos non Iudæi, ſed Eccleſia pro canonicis habet*; Which not the Iewes, but the Church hath for canonicall. I anſwere, That the Iewes did reiect them, *à canone fidei*, From the canon of faith: and the Church did receiue them *in canonem morum*, into the canon of manners. And that this is *Auſtins* meaning, it is plaine from the words which follow; The Church doth receiue them (not

Lege Auguſt. tom. 6. lib. 11. contr. Fauſt. Manich. cap. 5.
Tom. 5. lib. 15. de Ciu. Dei, cap. 23.
Tom. 1. lib. 2. Retract. c. 3.

to

to be the rule of faith: (*Sed propter quorundam Martyrum paſſiones*; But for the ſufferings of certaine Martyrs:) which ſerues for nothing, but to inflame our zeale by their conſtant paſsion, and to direct our conuerſation in a vertuous imitation of their perſeuering piety; but ſure, Maſter *Brereley* thought that euery man would haue taken his word and booke as authenticke, without peruſing the Text it ſelfe; elſe the Reader had neuer beene directed to this place in *Auſtin*, which tends chiefly to his ouer-throw.

Suppoſing your firſt ground to bee weake, you bring a more ſolid proofe *ex Tom. 3. lib. 2. de Doctrin. Chriſt. c. 8. Totus canon Scripturarum his libris continetur, &c.* The whole canon of Scriptures is contained in theſe Bookes. Where indeed hee numbers all theſe Bookes, but hee puts them not all *in canone fidei*, in the canon of faith: For, immediately after, in the beginning of his ninth Chapter, he layes downe this ground: *In his libris apertè poſita ſunt, vel præcepta viuendi, vel regulæ credendi*; In theſe Bookes are plainely laid downe, eyther the rules of ſound beleeuing, or the precepts of good liuing. Which is equiualent to that diſtinction vſed by the Church of *England*, of a two-fold canon; *Fidei & morum*, Of Faith and manners: So that in ſome ſort, all the Bookes may bee called Canonicall; ſome, *Canone fidei*, In the canon of faith, mentioned by *Auſtin*, *Lib. de vnitas. Eccleſ.* The reſt, *Canone morum*, In the canon of manners: And ſo the third Councell of Carthage, *Can.* 47. (though indeed it was not made in that Councell) is to be vnderſtood: *Cum hac diſtinctione poteris diſcernere dicta Auguſtini, & ſcripta in Concilio prouinciali Carthaginenſi*; With this diſtinction of a two-fold canon, you may vnderſtand the ſaying of Saint *Auſtin*, and the Decrees in the Councell of Carthage, ſaith *Caietan*: So in other parts of his workes, *Auſtin* reiects as Apocryphall, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and *the Booke of Wiſdome*. *Eccleſiaſticus non eſt liber Propheticus, lib. 1. Retract. c. 10. & in 2. lib. Retract. c. 4.* He ſayes, *Salomon* is not the Author of it; *& c. 20. Liber Sapientiæ non eſt authoritatis canonicæ*; onely they are cited by *Auſtin*, and read in the Church of

Lege Iren. lib 3. aduerſ. hæreſ. c. 1. Ioſephum lib. 1. cont. Appion. Euſebium lib. 3. hiſtor. Eccleſ. c. 10. Athanaſ. in Synopſ. Cypr. in Symb. Tertul. de habit. mulier. c. 3. Chryſoſt. hom. 8. in Epiſt. ad Hæbr. Hieron. in prolo. Galat. Grati. diſtinct. 19. Hug. de Sanct. Vict. lib. 1. De Sacram. c. 7. Lyram in præf. ad Tobi. & Hier. in prolog. ſup. Judith.

 England,

Vatab. in Mala. & confeſſ. Belgicam. art. 4. Concil. Laodicen. can. 59.

England, *propter eloquij ſimilitudinem, & plebis edificationem*; for ſimilitude of ſtyle, and edification of the common people: For, *inſpiratum & verè canonicum*, inſpired and truly & properly canonicall, are termes equiualent in Saint *Auſtins* language. How *Hoſpinian*, *Bucer*, and *Hyperius* haue cenſured this Father, I know not, becauſe I haue not their Workes at this preſent to view; but if you thus truely vnderſtand *Auſtin*, as I haue made it plaine vnto you, I am ſure he is free from the cenſure of D. *Field*, *Zanchie*, or *Sub:* as for D. *Raynolds*, hee names not *Auſtin* to this purpoſe in his ſecond concluſion.

Thus, Maſter *Brereley*, by proclayming your ſelfe victorious before the cauſe was examined, you may perceiue your ſelfe mightily deceiued: for in this weightie Controuerſie, concerning the number of the ſacred Scriptures, *Auſtin* (you ſee) is not yours; the Truth proclaimes him her owne, as hauing taught nothing but the truth. Firſt, that theſe Books called Apocrypha, are not to be admitted into the canon of Faith, as the rule of Faith; they are to be read *nulla cum neceſſitate credendi*, with no neceſsitie of beleeuing, ſaith *Auſtin*. Secondly, that they may be receiued into the canon of Manners, to be read for edification, *ſi ſobriè legantur*, if they bee read diſcreetly. It is Saint *Auſtins* limitation, *Lib. 2. contr. Gaudent. Epiſt. cap. 23.*

If any one deſire more knowledge in this poynt, I referre him to reade (as occaſion calls him) the Authors cited in the Margent, and hee ſhall ſee that this is the primitiue truth, taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and maintained by the Church of *England*.

SECT. 3.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Avstin *teach, that one text of Scripture may haue diuers true sensis?*

WE say, that although one text of Scripture may haue diuers applications, yet it hath but one true and proper signification: And so saith Saint *Austine*: *Vna eadémque res ideò multis modis dicitur; vt modus ipse dicendi, propter fastidium, varietur, sed propter concordiam, vna fides teneatur*: One and the same matter may be spoken diuers waies, that the manner of speaking, to auoid contempt and wearinesse, may be varied, so that (for peace and agreement) one and the same faith bee held and obserued. So that when we find many interpretations of one place of Scripture, we must not suppose they are diuers senses, but diuers applications of one sense; and therfore he exhorts vs to cleaue to that sense which was meant by the Spirit of God, the true Author of the Work; which because we cannot alwaies attaine vnto, and when wee cannot, he would haue vs to interpret it according to the Analogie of faith *In tanta multitudine verorum intellectuum, qui de paucis verbis eruuntur, id potissimum deligamus quod certum apparüerit, eum sensisse quem legimus: Si autem hoc latet, id certè, quod circumstantia Scripturæ non impedit, & cùm sana fide concordat*: In so great a multitude of true interpretations, which are drawne from a few words, let vs chuse that chiefely, which appeares to be the meaning of him whom we reade: But if this bee vnknowne, let vs certainely chuse that, which the circumstance of that Scripture doth not hinder, and which agrees with sound faith. So in another place, *Quia voluntatem autoris indagare nequiuimus, à regula tamen fidei, quæ per alias ejusdem authoritatis sacras literas satis fidelibus nota est, non aberrauimus*: Because we could not find out the meaning of the Author, yet we haue not err'd from the rule of faith, made

Tom. 3. enarr. in Psal. 46. præfat.

Lib. 1. de Genes. ad lit. c. 21.

Tom. 5. lib. 11. de ciuit. Dei, c. 33.

knowne by other Scriptures of the ſame authority. Moreouer Saint *Auſtin* tels vs, that when wee finde two or more expoſitions of one place of Scripture, (although the particular meaning of the Spirit in that place bee vnknowne) wee may without danger beleeue any of them, conditionally if they doe not differ from the rule of faith, taught in other places of Scripture: *Sine hoc aſſequatur, ſine aliam ſententiam, de illis verbis quæ fidei rectæ non refragatur exculpat, teſtimonium habens à quocunq; alio loco diuinorum eloquiorum; nihil periculi eſt*: Whether he attaine to this, or ſearch out any other meaning of thoſe words, which is not contrary to the right faith, hauing teſtimony from ſome other place of Scripture, it is no danger, ſaith *Auſtin*. From hence it is euident, that S. *Auſtin* did acknowledg but one true ſenſe of Scripture, which might be diuerſly applyed; and where that one ſenſe is vnknowne, the expoſition muſt be giuen agreeable to the Analogie of faith: neither doth that place which you alledge proue any thing to the contrary. For you cite him, ſaying, That two men may interpret one place of Scripture diuerſly, and yet both may be receiued, if both bee true: which is granted; That one text of Scripture may haue diuers applications, which doe not differ in the prime ſenſe and ſignification: and ſo Saint *Auſtin* is not contrary to thoſe two learned and laborious Doctors of our Church: his words are theſe: *Ita cum alius dixerit, Hoc ſenſit quod ego, & alius, Imò illud quod ego: religioſius me arbitror dicere, Cur non vtrunq; potius, ſi vtrunq; verum eſt?* So when one man ſaies, The meaning is as I ſay: and another, Nay, but rather as I ſay: I thinke I may ſay more faithfully and conſcionably, Why not both rather, if both bee true? This man interprets litterally, that myſtically: ſhould they be condemned, or condemne one another, when their lines may both meete in the center of one truth? Why ſhould not we allow both, with Saint *Auſtins* condition, *ſi vtrunq; verum eſt*; if both bee true? Two writers may interpret one place of Scripture diuerſly, and yet not differ; for Saint *Auſtin* ſets downe foure wayes of expounding

Tom. 3. lib. 3. de doct. Chriſt. c. 27.

Lib. 12. confeſſ. c. 31.

Tom. 1. lib. 12. confeſſ. c. 31.

Neque ego quod dixero præſcribo alteri, nec ille mihi: vtrunque accipiendum ſit, ſi vtriuſq; cum fide concordat. Aug. enar. in Pſal. 36.

Lib. de vtilit. credend. c. 3.

ding Scripture; *Secundùm Hiſtoriam, Analogiam, Allegoriam, & Ætiologiam:* but not once in all his Workes, doth he name thoſe ſeuerall differing ſenſes which you intrude vpon the Word of God, inuerting the certaintie of inſpired Diuinity (*quæ neſcit fallere*; which cannot deceiue any) into the doubtfull meaning of ſome *Delphian* Oracle; to make the Scripture ſpeake what you pleaſe, and with many meanings, better to vnderprop (that deluding engine of Satans inuention) Equiuocation:

Sic captare viros aucupis arte placet.

There may be diuers interpretations, and yet but one ſignification.

Vox diuerſa ſonat, populorum eſt vox tamen vna: *Mari.*

Diuers ſounds doe not make diuers truths; nor diuers interpretations diſtinct ſenſes. As for thoſe two which *Bellarmine* calls *Tropologicus* and *Analogicus*, they are both contained *ſub ſenſu Allegorico*: and to this, indeed, Maſter *Zanchie* conſents; being Saint *Auſtins* opinion, and the religion now taught in the Church of *England*. *Lib. 3. de interp. verb. Dei. cap. 3.* *Zanch. de Script.*

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Traditions of the Church ought to be receiued?*

NOn *afferamus ſtateras doloſas* (meaning traditions contradicting the written Word) *vbi appendamus quod volumus; ſed afferamus diuinam ſtateram de Scripturis ſanctis, tanquam de Theſauris dominicis, & in illa quid ſit granius appendamus:* Let vs not bring deceitfull ſcales, in which wee may hang what wee liſt; but let vs bring a diuine Ballance from the holy Scriptures, as it were from the Lords Treaſurie; and in that let vs weigh what is moſt ſubſtantiall, moſt ſolid. If Saint *Auſtin* had euer thought that Traditions, oppoſite to the written Word (for any other may be receiued) had bin neceſſary to ſaluation, he had neuer exhorted the *Donatiſts* to bring *Aug. tom. 7. lib. 2. de bapt. cont. Donatiſt. c. 6.*

their

their workes to be examined by the Diuine Rule; as hee did, both in this and other places: *Non audiamus, hæc dico, vel, hæc dicis: ſed audiamus, hæc dicit Dominus*: Let vs not heare theſe words, I ſay, or, You ſay; but let vs heare, Theſe words ſaith the Lord. *Controuerſia iudicem requirit, iudicet Chriſtus, &c.* The controuerſie requires a Iudge, let Chriſt iudge. Iudges muſt be ſought, (ſaid *Optatus* before *Auſtin*) there can none be found on earth; therefore he muſt be ſought from heauen: but why doe we knocke at heauen gates, when as wee haue him heere ſpeaking in the Goſpell? *Nolò humanis documentis, ſed diuinis oraculis, &c.* I will not haue the Church deſcribed by humane traditions, but by the diuine Oracles. So copious and plaine is Saint *Auſtin*, in all his diſcourſes concerning the perfection of Scripture, if I ſhould ſtand to cite him at large, I ſhould be drawne beyond the limits of my intended diſcourſe: This is ſufficient to ſhew that Saint *Auſtin* neuer approued of any traditions, which were not grounded vpon the Word of God. And I know (Mr. *Brereley*) that you haue beene ſo conuerſant in reading Saint *Auſtin*, that you cannot chuſe but acknowledge this truth: and therefore you may anſwere me, as Saint *Auſtin* ſuppoſes certaine Hereticks to anſwere him in his time.

Lib. de vnit. Eccl. cap. 2.

Lib. 2. de nupt. & concupiſ. c. 33.

Epiſt. Aug. 48.

Optatus lib. 5. cont. Parm.

Epiſt. præcit. ad Vincent pa. 167.

Verum eſt quod dicis, non eſt quod reſpondeatur;
Sed durum eſt nobis, traditiones parentum relinquere.

What you ſay is true, there is no ſound anſwere to bee giuen; but it is hard for vs to leaue the traditions of our Fathers. *Vobis durum eſt traditiones parentum relinquere*; being ſuch, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes of in the ſame Epiſtle, *qui nolunt veritati conſentiri, nec victi, ne erraſſe videantur*: who will not yeeld to the truth, no not when they are ouercome, leſt they ſhould ſeeme to haue erred.

To the firſt place which you vrge (*lib. 10. de Gen. ad lit. c. 23.*) I anſwere: That the place is ſuſpected, and the reaſon is, becauſe the printed Copie diſſents from the Manuſcript, in putting *eſſet* for *eſſe*: and therefore it can bee no ſound place to proue any thing from.

For anſwere to the reſt which you haue cited out of *Auſtin*,

Auſtin, becauſe the meaning and ſenſe is one in all, Ile peruſe one for all, *Ex Tom. 1. Epiſt. 118. ad Ianuar. cap. 1.* Wherein Saint *Auſtin* goes about to inſtruct *Ianuarius*, what he ſhould doe concerning Ceremonies and Traditions, about which certaine particular Churches did differ. The yoke (ſaith he) of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt is light; giuing vs Sacraments in number feweſt, in obſeruation eaſieſt, and in ſignification moſt excellent; as Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper: *& ſi quid aliud in Scripturis canonicis commendatur*: and if there be any thing elſe commended to vs in the Canonicall Scriptures; allowing no other traditions nor ceremonies, but ſuch as are commended to vs in the Canonicall Scripture, or at leaſt agreeable to the ſame: And to all ſuch traditions (taught by *Auſtin*, and receiued by the Church of *England*, I was euer reſolued moſt willingly to ſubſcribe. Now this word (*Tradition*) may be taken two waies. Firſt, *pro actione tradendi*, hauing reſpect to Chriſt, his Apoſtles, and the Militant Church; who, without doubt, deliuered nothing, but what was conſonant to the written Word. Secondly, *Pro doctrina tradita*, which is either agreeable or contrary to the written Word. The firſt Saint *Auſtin* admits, but denyes the latter; as it is plaine out of the ſame Epiſtle. *Quod enim neq; contra fidem, neq; contra bonos mores iniunguntur, indifferenter eſt habendum, &c.* That which is enioyned, neither againſt faith nor good manners, is to bee held as indifferent: but if they be contrary either to faith or good manners, they are not to be kept. If there be any diuine Traditions, immediately from Chriſt; or Apoſtolicall, from the Apoſtles; or Eccleſiaſticall, from the Church, agreeing with the written Word; *pro eorum ſocietate inter quos viuitur, ſeruandæ ſunt*: they are to be kept, for the peace and ſociety of them amongſt whom we liue, ſaith *Auſtin*. And therefore when euer you entreate *de Verbo Dei non ſcripto*, of any vnwritten Word of God, doe not make Gods vnwritten Word to contradict his written Word: for that is ſacrilegious knauery; whereof you are accuſed here, and ſhall bee puniſhed for it (without repentance)

Cont. multitudin. ſacrament. papiſt.

Lib. 5. de bapt. cont. Donat. c. 23.

Lege Athanaſ. lib. cont. gentes. Baſil. mag. lib. de confeſſ. fidei. Cyril. de fide. Chryſ. in c. 10. Johann. Theod. con. hæret. Tertul. lib. cont. Hermog. Bel. lib. 4. de ver. Dei non ſcript. c. 2. & 5.

repentance) hereafter: but let your traditions haue Saint *Auſtins* limitation, (that they be neither againſt faith nor good manners) and they ſhall haue my approbation: for I had rather yeeld ſomething from my owne ſuppoſed knowledge, than rend my ſelfe from the vnity of the Church wherein I liue, onely becauſe I ſee them vſe ſome harmeleſſe ceremonies, neither burdenſome nor ſuperſtitious. *Ad quamcunq́, fortè veneris eccleſiam, eius morem ſerua, ſi non vis cuiquam eſſe ſcandalo, nec quenquam tibi:* To what Church ſoeuer thou commeſt, obſerue the cuſtome of that Church, if thou wilt not bee a ſcandall to any, nor haue any to be a ſcandall to thee, was the counſell of *Ambroſe* to Saint *Auſtin*: onely you muſt giue me leaue for this time, to hold what I beleeue, That traditions repugnant to the written Word, are not to be beleeued. This was S. *Auſtins* Religion, and is now the Religion taught in the Church of *England*.

Art. 34. Eccleſ. Anglic.

SECT. 5.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that all Heretickes doe rely or inſiſt onely on the Scripture?*

SAint *Auſtin* (you ſay) teacheth, That all Hereticks doe inſiſt onely vpon the Scriptures. Which I deny: for you doe not. If *Auſtin* had euer ſaid, that Mr. *Brereley* had relyed only on Scriptures, I would haue left him. So the *Donatiſts* were hereticks, yet they did not inſiſt ony on Scripture, as S. *Auſtin* himſelfe teſtifies of them: *Vniuerſos Donatiſtas non audimus, quia nullum pro ſe teſtimonium de diuinis literis proferunt, quo id doceant:* Wee doe not heare all the *Donatiſts*, becauſe they bring for themſelues no teſtimony from the Diuine Letters, whereby they might teach it. Saint *Auſtin* would not heare the *Donatiſts* in that particular, becauſe they brought no teſtimony out of Scripture to confirme their opinion; but did alledge Fathers as well as Scriptures. So did the *Pelagians* againſt

Tom. 2. Epiſt. 48. poſt medium.

againſt Saint *Auſtin* himſelfe, *Tom. 7. lib. de nat: & grat. cont. Pelag. c. 61, 62.* And the *Arrians* vſed traditions for the vpholding of their opinion, as one of your owne writers teſtifies. *Lindan. lib. 2. panopl. c. 11.* and heere I appeale to the moſt partiall Iudge, whether it be not impudency in any to affirme the contrary. For anſwere then to that which you alledge *ex Tom. 6. lib. 1. cont. Maxim. Si quid de diuinis Scripturis protuleris, quod commune eſt cum omnibus, neceſſe eſt vt audiamus, &c.* If you bring any thing out of the ſacred Scriptures, which are common with all men, we muſt of neceſsity heare. It is true, that when S. *Auſtin* and that *Arrian* Biſhop were met together, to diſpute concerning Religion, *Maximinus* ſpoke thoſe words to Saint *Auſtin*; but you cannot reade, that *Auſtin* reproued him for cleauing to the Scripture, neither euer did he. Againe, Proteſtants do not require proofe out of Scripture, for euery word whereby they expreſſe their faith: they require not, that the word *homouſion* ſhould be ſhewed them in Scripture, as the *Arrians* did. It was a fault of the *Arrians*, that they required proofe out of Scripture for words, when as we require it onely for Doctrines; for which Saint *Auſtin* commended the *Arrians*, that they wiſht to be found good followers of the holy Scriptures: being vnwilling to preſſe them, or to be preſt by them, with the authority of the *Nicene* or *Arimine* Councell: For hee himſelfe, in his Controuerſies, flies to the Scriptures, which were indifferent to both ſides. *Iſta controuerſia Iudicem quærit; iudicet ergo Chriſtus, & cum illo iudicet Apoſtolus, quia & in illo ipſe loquitur Chriſtus:* That Controuerſie requires a Iudge; therefore, let Chriſt iudge, and with him let the Apoſtle iudge, becauſe that Chriſt himſelfe ſpeakes in and with the Apoſtle. Hee goes not to traditions, though in ſuch ſort as I haue ſhewed, hee allowed them, but to Chriſt, *Iudicet Chriſtus, &c.* Againe, you vrge another place to the ſame purpoſe, *ex Tom. 3. lib. 1. de Trinitate, cap. 3. Omnes ex ijſdem Scripturis, alſas & fallaces opiniones ſuas conentur defendere:* All men from the ſame Scriptures, doe labour to defend their falſe and deceitfull

Tom. 7. lib. 2. de nupt. & concup. c. 33.

Lege Aug. lib. 2. cont. Creſc. Gram. c. 21. Serm. 29. de Verb. Dom.

deceitfull opinions. Thoſe are the words indeed (if thoſe Bookes *de Trinit.* be Saint *Auſtins*;) but hee gathers not that from them which you would haue granted; That becauſe Hereticks vrge Scripture, therfore we ſhould leaue Scripture. The diuels alledging Scripture againſt our Sauiour, did not cauſe him to forſake them; neither did the Hereticks, by their abuſe of Scripture, make *Auſtin* to diſtaſte it: for ſaith hee, *In lege domini meditor, ſi non die & nocte, ſaltem quibus temporum particulis poſſum, &c.* I meditate in the Law of the Lord, if not day and night, yet at leaſt, all thoſe parcels of time that I can be at leiſure. Only this is his meaning in that place by you cited: That ſeeing Heretickes did ground their opinions vpon Scripture, therefore he ought to be exceeding laborious, diligent, and carefull in expounding the Theoremes of Diuinity, eſpecially about the Trinity; that ſo Truth beeing freed from errour, Heretickes might there find no ſeeming place of protection. To ſhut vp all in a word, Hereticks (you ſay) haue done and doe continually abuſe Scripture, to prooue their hereſies; therefore we ought not to vſe them, but to fly to Traditions. An Argument beyond the degree of ridiculous: Either diſpute more probably, or elſe confeſſe for ſhame, (Mr. *Brereley*) That *Romes* Diadem is vpheld by weake Sophiſtrie. For the reſt which you bring: *Quod natæ non ſunt hæreſes, niſi dum Scripturæ bonæ non bene intelliguntur:* That hereſies are neuer begot, but when good Scriptures are not well vnderſtood; is moſt true; but nothing againſt the Church of *England*, which holds the very ſame: And therefore thoſe *Donatiſts*, and all ſuch others, *qui tenent Scripturas ad ſpeciem, non ad ſalutem*; who vſe the Scriptures for a ſhew onely, and not to their ſaluation, are iuſtly cenſured by Saint *Auſtin*, and condemned by the Church of *England*.

Baſil. epiſt. 80.

Tom. 9. tract. 18. in Ioh.

Tom. 3. de. Gen. ad lit. lib. 7. c. 9.

Lib. de bapt. cont. Donat. c. vlt.

As for thoſe other Authors which you haue brought either againſt *Auſtin* or for him, as *Tert. Hil. Athan. Polan.* Maſter *Cartwright*, and the whole rabblement of Puritans, Browniſts, and Anabaptiſts, giue mee leaue to ſay of them, as Saint *Auſtin* did once *de concilio Ariminenſi*, being

being compelled thereunto by a Frier-like confeſsion of *Maximinus*, that hee beleeued as that Councell had decreed: *Noli me mittere ad ea ſcripta* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) *quæ modò aut præsunu non ſunt, aut eorum authoritate non teneor*; Doe not ſend me to their writings, which now either are not at hand, or elſe ſuch as I am not bound with their authoritie. My concluſion ſhall be an exhortation to all of my owne profeſsion, in the words of Saint *Auſtin*, euen *Ex hæreticorum inquietudine, vt Scripturas vigilantiùs perſcrutemur, &c. ita vt quòd in inimicus perniciem machinatur, Deus conuertat in adiutorium, per Ieſum Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum*; Let the troubleſome noyſe of hereticks (all crying, Great and many are the traditions of *Rome*) ſtirre vs vp to ſearch the Scriptures more diligently: ſo that what the enemy imagins craftily for our deſtruction, God may turne to our great helpe and euerlaſting comfort, through Ieſus Chriſt our Lord and onely Sauiour. *Amen*.

Tom. 6. lib. 1. cont. Maxim. Arrian. Epiſc.

Tom. 2. Epiſt. 105. Sixto.

CHAP. IIII. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Church of Chriſt is free from Errour?*

IT was the hereſie of the Manichees, and is the hereſie, at this day of the Browniſts, to teach that the Church of Chriſt on earth, ſhould be abſolutely pure from ſin and error; which is impoſsible; *donec perducatur ad gloriam, vbi ei nulla inſit macula vel ruga*; vntill ſhee be tranſlated to glory, when ſhee ſhall haue neither ſpot nor wrinkle, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeaks: neither can any man defend this opinion, but hee muſt needes be eyther a Manichee or a Browniſt; and I would to God that as you are in opinion, ſo alſo you were in perſon, a true Separatiſt; that *Rome* or *Amſterdam* might

limit your infectious breath; for Saint *Auſtin* was neuer the Author of any ſuch Aſſertion; the moſt that euer *Auſtin* ſaid, was, that the Church of Chriſt had neither *maculam* nor *rugam*; which was ſpoken with reference to the Church triumphant; as hee interprets himſelfe, *lib.1. retract.cap.19. Non ideò dixi, quia nunc ex omni parte talis eſt, ſed vt talis ſit, quando Chriſtus apparuerit*; I ſaid it not therefore, becauſe it is now ſo, in euery part or member, but becauſe it ſhall be ſo, when Chriſt ſhall appeare. So wee ſay it is moſt true, that the Church ſhall be freed from all errour and imperfection, when Chriſt ſhall appeare in glory, but not before. Read but the ſeuenth Chapter of Saint *Auſtin, lib.4.cont. duas Epiſt. Pelag.* and then ſend mee word whether you can poſsibly wreſt him to your purpoſe, to make vp this concluſion, That the militant Church ſhould be free from ſinne and errour in this life; as for your quotations, they are neuer able to proue your aſſertion, though all of them be vrged by *Bellarmine*, and all or moſt of them by *Andradius*, to that purpoſe: onely they proue vnto vs, that Saint *Auſtin* did highly commend the authority of that Church, *quam Scripturæ demonſtrent*, and being directed by the Scripture; *quæ fallere non poteſt*, (ſaith he) the Scripture is free from errour both actiue and paſsiue, and ſo may the true Church be, as long as ſhee is directed by the Scripture: and ſo Saint *Auſtin* would haue vs yeeld to the Ordinances of the Church, as long as it enioynes nothing *contra fidem vel mores*, againſt faith or manners: but hee neuer ſayes that the Church cannot erre. So in his 118. Epiſt. *ad Ianuarium*, hee tells *Ianuarius* what to do in matters of indifferency (as for the receiuing of the Lords Supper, whether in the morning, after ſupper, faſting, or otherwiſe) *Si diuinæ Scripturæ præſcribit authoritas, non eſt dubitandum, quin ita facere debeamus vt legimus*; If the authoritie of diuine Scripture doe preſcribe a way, it is not to be doubted but that we ought to doe as we reade. And a little after, *Et ſi quid horum tota per orbem frequentat Eccleſia*; And which of theſe ſoeuer the vniuerſall Catholique Church doth vſe. For indeed

De Serm. Dom. in monte.

Lib.2. de Retract. cap.18.

Bell.c.14. de Eccleſ.milit. Andrad. lib.2. defenſ. fid. Trident.

deed *Auſtin* thought it extreme madneſſe for a man to oppoſe himſelfe againſt the authoritie of the true Catholique Church, beeing directed by, or at leaſt not contradicting the written Word. To this limitation *Auſtin* ſtill holds himſelfe (which euery one ought to know that deſires rightly to vnderſtand him:) *Quod neque contra fidem, neque contra mores iniungitur, indifferenter eſt habendum, &c.* That which is enioyned by the Church, neither againſt faith nor good manners, is to be held as indifferent.

To conclude all, the Church of Chriſt may be conſidered two wayes: firſt, *ſpecialiter*, ſpecially, and in a moſt ſtrict ſence; ſo euery one of Gods Children may be called his Church; who are ſtill ſubiect to errour by your owne confeſsion: ſo that, *Bellarmine* reproues Pope *Innocent* the Third; and, in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, no particular member of the viſible Church is free from errour: therefore the Pope (if Saint *Auſtin* muſt be iudge) is no member of the militant Church, becauſe hee onely is free from errour in your iudgement. Secondly, it may be conſidered more generally, and ſo it is eyther triumphant, which is free from ſinne and errour; or militant, which is eyther particular and viſible, which by wofull experience wee finde to haue beene ſubiect to errour, and hath ſuffered ſhipwrack, leauing the Starre which ſhould haue directed her to the Hauen of happineſſe; or the vniuerſall and inuiſible Church; which during her militancy may partially erre in her members, totally, and in fundamentall poynts ſhee cannot. No true Church, being directed by the Word of God, can erre; but euery Church during her militancy, hath in her ſelfe the power of erring. To be abſolutely free from errour, is particular to a Deitie: *Chriſtus ſemper veraciter iudicat, homines plerunque fallantur*; Chriſt alwayes iudges truely, but men oftentimes doe erre, and may be deceiued, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*; and therefore the militant Church, conſiſting of men (to whom errour is inſeparable) ought not to equallize her ſelfe with Chriſt; the Church in *Auſtins* time durſt not, nor the Church of *England*.

Aliquando in ſolo Abraham erat Eccleſia, Auſt. enarrat. in Pſal. 128.

Lib. 2. de Purg. cap. 4.

The Pope excommunicated by Saint *Auſtin.*

Lege Hieron. in Dialog. cont. Luciferian. Chryſoſt. hom. 26. in 1. Epiſt. ad Cor. Euſeb. lib. 3. Hiſt. Eccleſ. cap. 32. Vincent. Lyrin. lib. aduerſ. hereſ. innouationes. c. 4.

Thus

Bernard. Serm. 33. in Cant. & Concil. Baſil.

Thus you ſee, Saint *Auſtin*, contrary to the generall Doctrine of you, Separatiſts, (extolling the Church onely, to deifie the Pope) agrees with vs ancient Catholiques, that the militant Church of Chriſt is not free from all errour, but ſhall be freed hereafter: which is alſo the Doctrine and Religion maintained by the Church of *England*.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Church of Chriſt is Catholique?*

Auſt. tom. 1. lib. de verâ re. &c. 7.

Tenenda eſt nobis Chriſtiana Religio, & eius Eccleſiæ communicatio, quæ catholica eſt, & catholica nominatur; The Chriſtian Religion of that Church is to be held of vs, which is indeed Catholique, and is named Catholique, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. Where, if you conſider the Fathers method, you may with great facility vnderſtand his meaning in the reſt of his workes: for, firſt hee ſets downe the reality, (*eius Eccleſiæ quæ Catholica eſt*;) and afterwards, the title or denomination (*et Catholica denominatur*) ſuppoſing that there might be a Church called Catholique, which was not indeed Catholique, as the Donatiſts called themſelues Catholiques, but were not; titles being nothing worth, where the reality is wanting; but if a Church be called Catholique, and be indeed Catholique, then the Chriſtian Religion of that Church is to be beleeued. That this was *Auſtins* Religion, it is plaine,

Lib. cont. Epiſt. Manich. c. 4. Lib. 2. cont. Don. Epiſcop. Epiſt. 170. ad Seuerin.

Ipſa Eccleſia Catholica, vnde καθολικὴ, Græcè appellatur, quod per totum terrarum orbem diffunditur, hanc ignorare nulli licet, &c. That Church which is called in Greeke (*Catholique*) becauſe it is ſcattered ouer the face of the whole earth: it is not lawfull for any to be ignorant of this Church. *Auſtin* thought that the true Catholique Church was the Church of Chriſt, and ſo doth the Church of *England*; admitting no true Church but the Catholique Church; and no true Chriſtians, but ſuch as are mem-

members of the Catholique Church; no true Proteſtant denying eyther the word *Catholique*, or the *Catholique Church*, which the Scriptures doe demonſtrate. So that if all thoſe things were to be found in the Church of *Rome*, which Saint *Auſtin* (grounding himſelfe vpon the Word of God) requires to be found in the Catholique Church, I ſhould willingly leaue ours, and cleaue vnto it: but I can proue, that our Church is a part of the true Catholique Church, profeſsing the truely ancient and Catholique faith, taught by Chriſt, his Apoſtles, and the Fathers, for ſixe or eight hundred yeeres after Chriſt (ſome little difference in ceremonies breakes no ſquare in the ſubſtance) and dare maintaine it againſt any Ieſuite *Italy* containes. As for Saint *Auſtin*, I ſhall make it plaine to the World (by Gods aſsiſtance) that his Religion confronts, *verbatim*, the chiefe poſitions of Popery: and therefore (louing Countrimen) as you expect and deſire the ſaluation of your ſoules, flye the factious poſitions of nouelty, and come and be receiued into the true Catholique Church; for without it there is ſaluation. And heere I profeſſe my ſelfe to be a true Catholique, a member of the Catholique Church; as ſome of my owne Countrie haue lately giuen out, that they thought I was a Catholique; and ſo indeed I am: But if any aske mee the way to the true Catholique Church, I muſt direct him to the Chriſtian-Catholique Church, which profeſſes the Religion now taught in the Church of *England*; for whereas you tye (*Catholique*) only to *Rome*, and call it the Roman-Catholique Church, it is all one as if you ſhould ſay, the particular vniuerſall Church: this word (*Catholique*) implying vniuerſality, and (*Roman*) particularity, being a terme diſtinctiue, to diſtinguiſh you from true Catholiques; and reſtrictiue, to binde the vniuerſall to the particular Church of *Rome*; as the followers of *Audius*, did call themſelues, *Chriſtiani Audiani*, to diſtinguiſh them from all others which did not adhere to the faction of *Audius*. *Epiphan. lib. 3. hæreſ. 70.*

Againe, the true Catholique Church, which is Catholique in name and nature, is that which teaches the true

faith; and to this Church, the reſt of the Fathers, as well as *Auſtin*, doe exhort vs to ioyne our ſelues. Hee that is without this Church, is a ſtranger to ſaluation, ſaith *Lactantius*. Without this Church, there is no ſaluation, ſaith *Auſtin*. Now that the Chriſtian Catholique Church is here meant, and not the Roman Catholique Church, *Auſtin* makes it manifeſt: *Eccleſia Catholica, Chriſtianorum mater veriſſima*; The Catholique Church, the trueſt Mother of Chriſtians, (ſaith hee) teaches vs to worſhip God purely: *Nullam nobis adorandam creaturam inducens, &c.* Neuer maintaining the worſhipping of creatures. And therefore hee could not vnderſtand it of the Roman Church, which propoſes as neceſſary, the adoration of creatures, as of Saints and Angels, but of the Chriſtian Catholique Church. Now, if there bee more Churches which are called *Catholique, (et haretici ſe Catholicos dici volint*; and Hereticks would haue themſelues called Catholiques, ſaith *Auſtin*; wee muſt not try the bare title, but muſt ſeeke out that Church, which is Catholique indeed; for this was Saint *Auſtins* Religion: *Si ſit Catholica* (there's the nature) *et nominetur Catholica* (there's the name) the Chriſtian Religion of that Church is to bee maintained. Thus (courteous Countriman) you may eaſily perceiue, that *Auſtin* and the Church of *England* are both Catholique. For concluſion, take this friendly admonition, *Vtile quod non vis do tibi Concilium*: Beware leſt the bare title of vniuerſality robbe you of the right of Chriſtianity; contemne it not, it is Saint *Auſtins*: *Si factis non oſtendis te Catholicum, omnes te Catholicum vocant, quid tibi prodeſt nomen, vbi res non inuenitur?* If thou doſt not ſhew thy ſelfe to be a Catholique in deedes, all men doe call thee a Catholique, but what will the name profit thee, where the thing it ſelfe is not found? *Tom. 9. expoſ. in Epiſt. Ioh. tract. 5.*

Lib. 4. Diuinar. inſtit. cap. 30.

Lib. 1. de morib. Eccleſ. c. 30.

Tom. 7. de vnitat. Eccleſ. c. 2. & 3.

Cont. Epiſt. Manich. c. 4.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the militant Church muſt euer continue, and that viſibly?*

Erit Eccleſia etiam illo tempore, quo ſoluendus eſt Diabolus; nunquam enim ab illo, Eccleſia ſe ducetur prædeſtinata & electa, &c. There muſt bee a Church, euen then when the Diuell is to be let looſe; Gods elect Church ſhall neuer be ſeduced from him: There muſt be a viſible Church, euen in the height of the reigne of Anti-chriſt; though not ſo conſpicuous to the world as at other times; neither is this contradicted by any Proteſtant that euer I read: as for Doctor *Fulk*, and D. *Willet*, they both grant the viſibility of the Church, in the ſame manner as *Auſtin* doth: for Saint *Auſtin* conſiders the Church in a two-fold ſtate, firſt of proſperity, and then ſhee flouriſhes, being as manifeſt to the world, as a Citie vpon a Hill, which cannot be hid during that ſtate: *Hæc eſt Ciuitas in monte poſita, quæ abſcondi non poteſt, &c.* This is the Citie placed vpon a Hill, which cannot be hid, ſaith *Auſtin*. And in his ſeuenth Tome, *lib. 2. contr. lit. Donat. cap. 32. Hinc fit, vt Eccleſia vera neminem lateat*; This true Church is hid from no man; *& Tome 6. contr. Fauſt. Manich. lib. 13. cap. 13.* In all which Saint *Auſtin* goes about to ſet forth the glory of the Church, beeing in her flouriſhing eſtate. Secondly, he conſiders the Church in the ſtate of perſecution, and then ſhee may be obſcured with multitude of ſcandals; as hee ſpeakes in his 48. Epiſt. *ad Vincent.* ſo that ſhee ſhall not appeare to all men. And that this is *Auſtins* opinion, it is ſo manifeſt, that no man will deny it, that can reade him; eſpecially in his 80. Epiſt. *ad Heſych. Quando enim Sol obſcurabitur, & Luna non dabit lumen ſuum, &c. Eccleſia non apparebit, impijs tunc proſecutoribus vltra modum ſæuientibus, &c.* When the Sun ſhall be darkened, and the Moone ſhall not giue her light, the

Auſt. tom. 5. lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 8.
Enarrat. in Pſal. 10.
Lib. 6. de Baptiſ. cont. Donatiſt. cap. 4.
Epiſt. 119. c. 6.
Lege Tract. de perpetua viſibilitate Eccleſ.
Tom. 8. enarrat. in Pſalm. 47.

Church ſhall not appeare, wicked perſecutors raging aboue meaſure. Where, by the darkning of the Sunne and Moone, *Auſtin* vnderſtands the obſcurity of the Church in time of perſecution: wicked perſecutors raging, the Church ſhall not appeare in her vſuall glory. No man can ſet downe his opinion in more manifeſt termes than theſe are (in the time of perſecution the Church ſhall not appeare;) and it is the very ſame, which is now taught in the Church of *England*; That there may come a time when the true Church ſhall not actually appeare: in ſo much that I dare boldly ſay, There is not one ſentence in all *Auſtins* workes, which contradicts this opinion of the Church of *England*: and moſt of your owne Writers (to which I onely referre the Reader) doe agree with Saint *Auſtin* and vs in this opinion: and therefore in *Bellarmines* iudgement, you doe but miſ-ſpend time, while you goe about to proue that which is granted by your ſuppoſed aduerſaries.

Suar. Tom. 2. in 3. part. dui. Thom. q. 59. diſp. 54. Sect. 6. Alex. part. 3. q. vlt. Turrecrem. de conſecrat. Teloſph. de mag. tribulat. pag. 32. Greg. de Valent. tom. 3 diſp. 1. q. 1. de propriet. Eccleſ. Bellib. 3 de Eccleſ. milit. c. 13.

To conclude, *Auſtin* holds, that the Catholique Church muſt continue to the end of the World, euen in the reigne of Antichriſt; but hee ſayes not that it ſhall be euer alike viſible; he plainely affirmes the contrary, as it is manifeſt *ex Epiſt.* 80. The Church is euer viſible in her owne nature, and yet may bee hindered from our ſight three manner of wayes: Firſt, *propter defectum organi*, for want of a fit organ; and that either externall, or internall; if the eyes of our body, and faith the eye of our minde bee wanting, wee cannot ſee the Church, no not in the moſt flouriſhing eſtate. Secondly, *propter defectum voluntatis*, for want of will: when wee haue ſuch wicked and depraued affections, that wee will not ſee the true Church, though it be moſt viſible. Thirdly, *propter defectum luminis*, for want of light: ſo when the clouds of perſecution haue cauſed a groſſe darkeneſſe to ouer-ſpread the World (as it once did; Arrianiſme hauing ouer-topt Chriſtianity, when the World was ſaid to pant vnder the burthen of Hereſie, and to grone to ſee it ſelfe become an Arrian) then the Church, though it be viſible *in potentia*, yet it ſhall not actually

Bonauent. lib. 1. diſtinct. 1.

actually appeare to the world, (as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes) not becauſe it ſhall then, or at any time totally periſh (as long as the head ſoares aboue, the body cannot drowne) but becauſe the light of proſperitie is wanting, the Sunne is darkened, and the Moone giues not her light, which ſhould direct our eyes to the Hill on which the Church is ſeated; for when but one *Athanaſius*, and a ſecond *Liberius* are left to maintaine the truth againſt the innouation of hereſie, it is impoſsible that the Church ſhould actually appeare to the whole World, though in it owne nature it be viſible. This was Saint *Auſtins* Religion, and is the Religion now taught in the Church of *England*: to which, both *Viega* and *Suarez*, Ieſuites, doe conſent; but ſure you doe not relye vpon Saint *Auſtins* opinion in this controuerſie, though you would make the ignorant Laitie ſo to beleeue, (onely to dazle their Eyes with the name of Antiquitie, when as indeed you want nothing more in your Religion than antiquitie) for *Bellarmine* ſayes, that *duo homines non ſunt Eccleſia*; Two men doe not make a Church; which is directly contradicted by Saint *Auſtin*; whoſe poſition ſhall be my concluſion: *Aliquando in ſolo Abel Eccleſia erat, aliquando in ſolo Enoch, aliquando in ſolo Abraham, Tom. 8. enarrat. in Pſalm. 128:* Sometimes the Church was in *Abel* onely, ſometimes in *Enoch* onely, and ſometimes onely in *Abraham*. So that the true Church is alwayes viſible, but not alwaies eminently viſible; which is the opinion alſo of the Church of *England*.

Theod. lib. 2. cap. 16.

Comment. in Apocal. Tom. 2. q. 59. art. 6.

Lib. 3. de Eccleſ. milit. c. 16. in reſpons. ad 1. argumentum.

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Church was built vpon the perſon of Saint* Peter?

Tu es Petrus, & ſuper hanc Petram ædificabo eccleſiam meam. Quid eſt, Super hanc Petram ædificabo eccleſiam meam? Thou art *Peter*, and vpon this Rocke will

Tom. 9. expoſit. in Epiſt. Ioh. tract. 1. paulò poſt initium.

will I build my Church. What meanes this, Vpon this Rocke will I build my Church? was a queſtion moued by Saint *Auſtin* himſelfe. So that if we can but find a reſolution in his Workes, wee haue his opinion concerning this controuerſie: neither need we reade much ere we finde it, for it follows immediately, *Super hanc petram* (i.) *Super hanc fidem, ſuper id quod dictum eſt, Tu es Chriſtus, Filius Dei viui, ſuper hanc petram* (ſaith Chriſt) *fundabo eccleſiam meam:* Vpon this Rocke, that is, vpon this faith, vpon that which was ſpoken, Thou art Chriſt, the Sonne of the liuing God, vpon this Rocke will I build my Church: So Saint *Auſtin*. And therefore (Mr. *Brereley*) I may ſay of you (whom vnknowne, the knowne truth makes me oppoſe) as *Æmilius Scaurus* ſaid of *Varius*: *Varius* ſaies (ſaith he) that *Æmilius Scaurus* betrayes the Common-wealth; *Æmilius Scaurus* denyes it: *Vtri creditis, auditores?* Whether will ye beleeue, courteous hearers? So you ſay, that Saint *Auſtin* teaches that the Church was built vpon the perſon of Saint *Peter*; Saint *Auſtin* himſelfe denyes it: *Vtri creditis, Lectores?* Whether will ye beleeue, iudicious Readers? And I am perſwaded, your Maſters of *Rome* could wiſh that you had either left this queſtion out, or elſe that you had ingeniouſly confeſſed Saint *Auſtin* your aduerſary; which your betters haue done: *Hunc locum vniuerſi Patres ita interpretati ſunt, &c. vnus quidem excipiendum eſt Auguſtinus*; ſaith *Greg. de Valentia:* All the Fathers haue thus interpreted the place; only one *Auſtin* is to be excepted. And *Bellarmine* entreating of this Controuerſie, doth not once name *Auſtin* to confirme his opinion, but accuſes him of ignorance, and confeſſes that Father to be againſt him. Therefore, leſt you ſhould fall into greater danger, by diſpleaſing the Ieſuites in writing ſo weakely, take Saint *Auſtins* counſell, and peraduenture you may creepe into their fauour againe. *Qui primas non potuit habere ſapientiæ, ſecundas habeat partes modeſtiæ; qui non valuit omnia dicere impœnitenda, ſaltem pœniteat, quæ cognouerit dicenda non fuiſſe*: Hee that could not haue the firſt parts of Wiſedome, let him haue the ſecond of modeſtie;

Greg. de Valent. 3. tom. de ob. fidei. q. 5. ſect. 28.

Lib. 1. de Rom. Pont. c. 10, 11.

Ex. prolog. Retract.

ſtie; he that could not ſpeake all things neuer to be repented of nor recalled, let him recall or retract thoſe things which he knowes he ſhould not haue ſpoken nor writ. Either ſay, *Gregory*, thou lyeſt, and call *Bellarmine* a dunce, or elſe ſend me a ſilent recantation, which ſhall recompenſe this vnaduiſed poſition.

It is true that Saint *Auſtin* was of that opinion; but he partly retracted it. *Non dictum eſt illi, Tues Petra, ſed Tues Petrus: Petra autem erat Chriſtus*: It was not ſaid vnto him, Thou art the Rocke, but Thou art *Peter*, for the Rocke was Chriſt: And altogether changed it in other parts of his workes, as it is euident *ex Tom. 9. tract. 124. in Ioh. Super hanc Petram quam confeſſus es, ædificabo Eccleſiam meam: Petra erat Chriſtus, ſuper quod fundamentum etiam ipſe ædificatus eſt Petrus, &c.* Vpon this Rocke which thou haſt confeſſed, I will build my Church; the Rocke was Chriſt, vpon which foundation euen *Peter* himſelfe was built. If the perſon of *Peter*, in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, did repreſent the Church; then, in his opinion, Chriſt did not build his Church vpon the perſon of *Peter*: but the former is true, (*Chriſtus Petra, Petrus Eccleſia*) therefore the latter, which is the Religion now taught in the Church of *England*; That the Church of Chriſt was not built vpon the perſon of *Peter*, but vpon the ſubſtance of his faithfull confeſſion. *Lib. 1. Retract. c. 21.*

Thoſe whom you intended to haue ſet at variance, are yet friends, and I pray God ſtill maintaine them friends to the Truth: for yet there is no difference betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Neither neede you to be aſhamed of this opinion, when many of your owne Popes haue maintained the ſame; and you are perſwaded, I hope, that a Pope cannot erre; therfore, it muſt needs be true, beeing confirmed by *Adrian* the fourth, in an Epiſtle to *Fredericke*; cited by *Bellarmine*, by *Innocent* the third, *lib. 1. de geſtis Friderici, c. 48.* by *Greg.* the great, *tom. 2. expoſ. 7. Pſalm. pœnitent.* by *Leo* the ſecond, *in Epiſt. ad Conſtant.* by *Felix*, *Epiſt 3.* By *Hildebrand*, or *Brand-hell*, in a Verſe to *Rodolph*, Duke of *Suevia*: *Lib. 1. de tranſl. Imperij, c. 3. ex lib. 1. Radevici Friſingenſ. c. 9.*

Petra

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodulpho.

So that you muſt either grant an errour in theſe Popes, (which I thinke you dare not) or elſe that *Auſtins* opinion is to be embraced, being ſeconded by moſt of the Fathers, which proclaimes *Greg. de Valent.* partiall in the queſtion) and by ſome of your both Cardinals and Schoole-men: Ile onely cite at large *Aquinas* (leſt the variety of quotation ſhould draw me beyond the limit of my intention) *Lect. 15. in c. 6. Joh. Petrus enim à Petra, Petra autem Chriſtus: in Petri ergo nomine, figurata eſt Eccleſia* (here you haue the very words of Saint *Auſtin*) *qua ſupra firmam Petram immobilem,* (i.) *Chriſtum, fundata eſt*: *Peter* from the Rocke, the Rocke was Chriſt: therefore in the name of *Peter* the Church was meant, which was founded vpon the firme and vnmoueable Rocke, Chriſt. If any one bee ouer-curious, and deſire more euidence, I haue packed together a whole Iury of Fathers and Schoole-men, who agree with Saint *Auſtin* in this interpretation. But you will ſay (I know, Mr. *Brereley*) that there is not one good nor true man amongſt them: trie before you cenſure; reade them as I haue cited them in the Margent, and then tel me; if you can except againſt any of them, you ſhall haue them chang'd, but your cauſe will bee neuer the better: Therefore if you be found guilty of abuſing the good Father (as I know you will) only craue pardon, with promiſe of amendment, and you ſhall haue the benefit of your Booke,

(*Reade right, and be ſaued.*)

Againe, you ſay that *Peter* was head of the whole Church; and ſeeme to proue it *ex Tom. 4. q. ex Nouo Teſtamento, q. 75.*: but I wonder much, why you goe about to derogate ſo much from the Chaire of Rome, as to proue *Peters* ſupremacy from a Booke which is ſo notoriouſly branded by *Bell. Liber iſte non eſt Auguſtini, nec hominis Catholici*, ſaith *Bell. multa docens contra fidem & contra Auguſtinum*: That Booke is not *Auſtins*, nor any Catholikes, teaching many things both againſt the faith, and againſt Saint *Auſtin*: *Lib. 2 de effect. Sacrament. c. 10.* In diuers others you may reade the like cenſure.

Thus

1. *Hiero. lib. 1. in Math. c. 7.*
2. *Ambroſ. ſerm. 84.*
3. *Tertul. lib. 4. aduerſ. Marc. c. 13.*
4. *Cyril. lib. 4. dialog.*
5. *Hilar. lib. 6. de Trinit.*
6. *Chryſoſt. hom. 55. in Math.*
7. *Euſeb. hom. in natal. pet.*
8. *Theod. in c. 3. 1. epiſt. ad Cor.*
9. *Anſel. in c. 16. Math.*
10. *Peter. Bene. lib. 2. in Dan.*
11. *Hug. Card. com. in Math.*
12. *Nich. Lyran. & Carion. lib. 2. pag. 39.*

Lib. de grat. primi hominis c. 3.

Thus you ſee, by following *Greg. de Valent.* too cloſe, you haue coozened your ſelfe: for, in ſtead of turning a part of this Latine into Engliſh, you haue tranſlated your owne Religion into the language of ſuſpicion: this weake penning hath ruinated your ſuppoſed Supremacy, and the reading of it makes your owne countrie-men aſhamed.

The next you vrge, is ſomething more to the purpoſe, *ex Tom. 8. enarrat. 1. in Pſal. 108.* where Saint *Auſtin* makes a compariſon betweene *Peter* and *Iudas*: *Peter*, ſaith hee, did repreſent the perſon of Chriſts friends; *Iudas* of his enemies: ſo that in *Auſtins* opinion, what ſupremacy *Iudas* had ouer Chriſts foes, that *Peter* had ouer his friends; which was no primacy of power or dominion, but only of order; in that (as *Peter* did the Elect to life) ſo he led them the miſerable way to deſtruction. *Auſtin* grants to Saint *Peter*, *primatum numeri, confeſſionis & ordinis*, a primacy of number, confeſsion, and order; but no ſupremacy of rule or dominion: and thus much is granted to Saint *Peter* by the Church of *England*. Ile end this controuerſie, with *Auſtins* deſcription of Saint *Peter*: *Quod ad ipſum propriè attinet, naturâ, vnus homo erat; gratiâ, vnus Chriſtianus; abundantiore gratiâ, vnus idemq; primus Apoſtolus*: As for that which properly concernes Saint *Peter*; by nature, he was one man; by grace, one Chriſtian; by more abundant grace, one and the firſt or chiefe Apoſtle. But when Chriſt ſaid vnto him, *Tibi dabo claues: vniuerſam ſignificabat Eccleſiam*: I will giue thee the Keyes of the Kingdome, he meant the whole Church, and not *Peter* onely. So *Auſtin, Tom. 9. expoſit. in Euang. Ioh. tract. 124.*

Lege etiam Eraſ. præfix. Maldonat. com. in Ioh. Perer. comment. in Rom. Et Hardingum de noſtrate ſacrificio Miſ. Baſil de vit. ſolit. Tertul. Lib. de præſcript. Cyprian. lib. de vnit. Eccleſ. Ambroſ. de ſacr. incarnat. c. 5. Orig. tract. 1. in Matth. Chryſoſt. hom. 44. in Matth. Sine vlla contumelia, Cyprianus Petro comparatur. Auſt. lib. 2. de bapt. cont. Donat. c. 1.

Sect. 5.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *giue any primacy of power or dominion to the Romane Church?*

Auſt. Tom. 7. lib. 2. cont. lit. Petil. Donat. c. 51.

Si omnes per totum orbem tales eſſent, quales vaniſſimè criminaris, Cathedra tibi quid fecit eccleſiæ Romanæ, in qua Petrus ſedit, & in qua hodiè Anaſtaſius ſedet, vel Eccleſiæ Hieroſolymitanæ, in qua Iacobus ſedet, & in qua hodie Iohannes ſedet, quibus nos in catholica vnitate connectimur, &c? If all Churches in the world were ſuch, as thou doſt moſt vainely accuſe them, yet what hath the Romane Church done vnto thee, wherein *Peter* ſate, and wherein *Anaſtaſius* doth now ſit; or the Church at *Hieruſalem*, wherein *Iames* ſate, and wherein *Iohn* doth now ſit; by which we are knit together in Catholike vnity, &c. Wherby S. *Auſtin* ſhewes to the Donatiſt, that he did reuerence the Church at *Hieruſalem*, as well as the Church at *Rome*: For he ſayes not, *Quâ connectimur*, tying himſelfe to the Romane Church only; but, *Quibus connectimur*, implying both. And it is certaine, that in the ſixth Councell of *Carthage*, when the Biſhop of Rome did falſely alledge one of the Canons of the *Nicene* Councell, to obtaine for himſelfe onely this ſupremacy ouer the Chriſtian world, that then Saint *Auſtin* did detect and lay open his ſubtilty, denying him any ſupremacy of power or dominion ouer other Biſhops: onely a primacy of order was granted by ſome (among whom Saint *Auſtin* was one) but by more denyed to the Church of Rome: For if you bee at leiſure to reade ouer a little Chronologie, you ſhall finde that it was two hundred yeeres (at leaſt) after the dayes of *Auſtin* and *Anaſtaſius*, before any ſuch primacy was granted to the Church of Rome; and then it was onely by this occaſion: *Phocas* hauing ſlaine *Mauricius* and his children, was proclaimed Emperour, and approued by *Boniface* the third,

Chriſtoph. Helui. in theatro hiſt. Duarenum lib. 1. de ſacris Eccleſ. benef. c. 16.

third, he beeing a Tyrant, yet to gratifie the Pope for his iniuſt approbation of him in that wicked action, *Primatum ſuper omnes eccleſias conceſſit Bonifacio tertio*: he granted to *Boniface* 3. a primacy ouer all other Churches, ſaith the Chronologer. And ſome eight or nine yeeres after, there was a Councell held at Rome, wherein this priuiledge of *Phocas*, *de primatu Eccleſiæ Romanæ*, of the primacy of the Romane Church, was proclaimed and ratified.

Heere you haue the originall of the Popes ſupremacie, which was a priuiledge granted to *Boniface* the third (as a gratuity for his approbation) by the Emperour *Phocas*; who raigned ſixe hundred and tenne yeeres after Chriſt; which is two hundred yeeres after *Auſtin*: So that from hence I may conclude, That Saint *Auſtin* could not hold that ſupremacie which you dreame of, (he withſtood it in the Councell of *Carthage*) becauſe it was granted to the Church of Rome by the Emperour, long after the death of *Auſtin*.

For anſwere then to thoſe places which you haue cited out of *Auſtin*: It is true, that in his 162 Epiſtle, hee giues a primacy of order to the Church (*Cathedræ Apoſtolicæ*) becauſe the chiefe Apoſtle (as he thought) was ſeated there. But chiefely in his 92. Epiſtle *ex Concilio Mileuitano*, to Pope *Innocent*, wherein he attributes much to the Church of Rome, ſtanding in that integrity, in which at that time it did. But for that other place which you vrge, it is ſpoken of the vniuerſall Catholike Church (*nos non dubitamus, eius Eccleſiæ condere gremio, et cui nolle primus dare impietatis eſt*) and not onely of the Church of Rome, as you ſuppoſe: to giue to the Church of Rome a primacy of order, and to deny it ſupremacy of dominion, was indeed *Auſtins* Religion, neither is it contradicted by the Church of *England*. *Ex Tom. 6. li. de vtilit. cred. c. 17.*

To conclude, I could [illegible]y grant that primacy to the Church of Rome which *Auſtin* did, if Rome were not infected with many ſtrange poſitions, vnknowne to Saint *Auſtin*: for now it is 1220. yeeres ſince Saint *Auſtin* writ; ſo that to apply what he ſpoke of the ſtate of the Church in his time, to the ſtate of the Church now in our

time, is but weake Philoſophy, and worſe Diuinity. Therfore let no man hereafter be deceiued, by reading or hearing *Auſtin* alledged; for he writ of the Church of Rome, before ſhe was ſo groſly infected as now ſhee is; as any one may perceiue, that reades theſe Controuerſies, between Mr. *Brereley* accuſing, and me defending Saint *Auſtin*. But let the Church of Rome returne to her ancient integrity, and to that ſtate wherein ſhe ſtood in Saint *Auſtins* time, and I, for my part, *in illius gremio memetipſum condere non dubitabo*; I will not doubt, ſafely to repoſe my ſelfe in her lappe: Ile dedicate my ſtudies to patronize her ancient purity, but haue alwayes vowed my ſelfe an enemy to all pernicious and ſchiſmaticall nouelty. Let *Tertullians* opinion conclude the queſtion of the Churches ſupremacy: *Omnes Eccleſiæ ſunt primæ, & omnes Apoſtolicæ, ſi vnam (& primam) omnes probant vnitatem. Lib. de præſcript. aduerſ. hæret. cap.* 20. All Churches are ſupreme and Apoſtolicall, which approue the firſt Apoſtolicall truth and vnity: but the Church of Rome does not, and therefore ſhe cannot haue that primacy nor power which belongs to euery true Church.

Sect. 6.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *deny Eccleſiaſticall ſupremacy to Emperours and Kings?*

D. *Bilſon. de poteſt. Regis.*

IT is the generall tenent of our Engliſh Diuines, that Emperours and Kings haue ſupreme authority, not onely in ciuill affaires, but alſo in matters of Religion, to command for truth: and it is alſo the tenent of Saint *Auſtin*, (nothing being taught by him more euidently) *Reges Deo ſeruiunt, ſi in ſuo regno bona iubeant, & mala prohibeant, non ſolùm quæ pertinent ad humanam ſocietatem, verùm etiam quæ ad diuinam Religionem*: Kings ſerue God, when they command good things, and forbid euill in their owne Kingdome, not only in matters of humane ſociety, but

Tom. 7. Lib. 3. con. Creſc. Gram. c. 51.

but alſo in matters which concerne Religion. So in another place hee ſayes, that whoſoeuer contemnes the ſupreme Magiſtrate, commanding for truth, doth purchaſe to himſelfe iudgement: And hee ſharpely reproues *Petilianus* the Donatiſt, for ſaying as you doe: *Quid nobis eſt cum Regibus ſeculi, &c?* That wee haue nothing to doe with earthly Kings, but ſhould be exempted from the yoke of their ſecular power: and yet Maſter *Brereley* very bluntly denyes it.

Epiſt. 166. & Epiſt. 50. Lib. 2. cont. lit. Petil. cap. 92.

Where a faire out-ſide is the Ambaſſadour of a ſpotleſſe minde, there that faireneſſe makes the ſubiect moſt reſplendent; but if the tongue proclaime hoſtility, the heart muſt needs be full fraught with enmity. Iudge then (courteous Reader) of Maſter *Brereleyes* diſpoſition, how trayterous his thoughts muſt needes be, whoſe hand dares hold a Pen to publiſh treaſon, againſt ſuch ſacred Maieſtie; firſt, to dedicate his Booke vnto him, as though it were out of loue to our Soueraignes pietie, and after, to robbe him of his Princely dignity. And here (dread Soueraigne) diſdaine not to accept at the hands of a loyall ſubiect, the true Anatomie of Popery; ouerturning of Empires, deposing of Kings, and blowing vp of Parliaments: their lawes are cruell againſt Princes, and muſt be writ in bloud; *nec gaudet tenui ſanguine tanta ſitis*; they ayme at the Higheſt, their chiefeſt obiect is a Crowne; *& ius violandum eſt regnandi gratia*; let them deale neuer ſo fairely in the beginning, yet here they end in robbing Princes of their Prerogatiue-Royall. A King muſt be no King, where a true Papiſt breathes: *et ex hoc vno, diſce omnes*; from this one, iudge of the reſt: Emperours and Kings haue no ſupremacy in matters of Religion.

Ingenij oraculum Sydneus Archad.

Priſca fides taceat.....
Res noua, non vllis cognita temporibus.

Antiquity muſt hold her peace; let Nouelty plead your cauſe, or elſe your negatiue opinion concerning the Kings Supremacy, muſt be reiected as infectious hereſie.

Saint *Auſtin* neuer durſt deny it,.....*O Caſar,*
Crede mihi, numen ſentit & ille tuum.

Tom.7.lib.1. cont.Epiſt.par. poſt med.

ſtill crying out to the Donatiſts, *Reddite Cæſari quod Cæſaris eſt, & Deo quod Dei eſt*; Giue to *Cæſar* what belongs to *Cæſar*; and to God, the things which belong to God: and giuing the reaſon why thoſe Heretiques would not ſubmit themſelues to the Emperour in matters of Religion, ſayes, It was becauſe they were *inobedientes & impij, qui nec Deo reddunt Chriſtianum amorem, nec Regibus humanum timorem*; diſobedient and wicked, which giue neither Chriſtian loue to God, nor humane feare to Kings. And now ſhew mee, by what euaſion can you diſtinguiſh your ſelues from wicked and diſobedient Donatiſts, who were ſo cenſured by Saint *Auſtin*, onely becauſe they would not ſubmit themſelues in matters of Religion, to the Decrees of the Emperour? When Saint *Auſtin* had finiſhed his foure Bookes againſt *Creſconius* the Donatiſt, then *Honorius* enacted Lawes againſt them, (becauſe our Peace-preſeruer does the like, you call him an vſurping Heretique) for which Saint *Auſtin* commends him; and becauſe the Donatiſts would not ſubmit themſelues to thoſe Lawes, he writ a Booke *De correctione Donatiſtarũ*, as he teſtifies himſelfe.

Lib.2.Retract. cap.48.

Againe, the Donatiſts made diuers obiections againſt Saint *Auſtin*; view them, and you ſhall perceiue they are the very ſame, that our aduerſaries make againſt the Truth at this day. As firſt, *Fas non eſt* (ſaith the Donatiſts) *vt dicat Imperator de religione*: It is not meet, that the Emperor ſhould determine any thing of Religion. To which Saint *Auſtin* anſwers by another queſtion; Why then (ſaith hee) did you appeale to the Emperour, or ordaine him as Iudge of your cauſe? Secondly, though they did appeale to him, and were conuict by him, *Non tamen ad Imperatorum poteſtatem, hæc coercenda vel punienda, pertinere debere*; Yet it doth not belong to the power of the Emperour, to correct or puniſh theſe things. And is not this the very ſame that a true Ieſuite muſt maintaine, & euery true Papiſt is bound to beleeue, That what-euer is determined by the Clergy (be it Sacriledge or Blaſphemy) the Emperour is bound to ſee it executed, not to correct or puniſh them offending.

fending. To this, Saint *Auſtin* anſweres by a poſitiue interrogation: *Quia in re quæro* (ſaith hee) *quid dicant, An quia de Religione vitioſa vel falſa, nihil curandum eſt talibus poteſtatibus?* Muſt Emperours and Kings ſtand for cyphers in the Houſe of God, without coactiue Primacy in the weightieſt affaires? *Auſtin* (you ſee) thought it ſtrange, that the Donatiſts ſhould exempt Princes from a commanding power in matters of Religion. Concluding that princely diligence in reforming Eccleſiaſticall affaires, was farre more iuſt than priuate violence eyther in Laitie or Clergie. Laſtly, they obiected, That thoſe powers were not permitted to regard ſuch things. To which, Saint *Auſtin* replyes: *Propter quid ergo gladium portat, qui dictus eſt Miniſter Dei?* Why is the King called Gods Miniſter? but to ſee that each member performes his duety to the head. To what end doe Kings beare the Sword? but to curbe vnruly motions in the militant body. Were it not for the ſupreme authoritie of Kings, we ſhould haue vnruly ſubiection in the one, and ſtrange confuſion of nouelty with antiquity in both States. This Saint *Auſtin* well knew, which made him ſo earneſt to defend the Supremacy of Kings, in matters of Religion againſt the Donatiſts.

Epiſt. Auguſt. 50.

Lege Plutarch. in vit. Lycurg. Athanaſ. in Apolog. ad Arrian. Imperat. Iob. Chryſoſt. in c. 13. Epiſt. ad Rom. Amb. cont. Auxin. Tertull. in Apolog. aduerſ. Gent. cap. 1.

Now to your Obiections. I grant, that Saint *Auſtin* was preſent at the firſt Milleuitane Councell, wherein it was decreed, That men ſhould not appeale to the Emperour for any releaſe by publique iudgement, in caſe of deſerued excommunication: For the iudgement of the Church is two-fold: firſt, in caſe of controuerſie betwixt man and man, or particular Churches; in this caſe, Saint *Auſtin* leaues coactiue power in the hands of the ſupreme Magiſtrate, to compell oppoſers to embrace the truth, as I haue already proued; neither was this contradicted by that Councell. Secondly, in caſe of puniſhment, to excommunicate, which belongs onely to the Church; ſo that for performance of this, we are not to ſeeke for authoritie from the Emperour; neither ought any man in this caſe to appeale from the Church to the Secular powers;

See the word of the Councell, *can. 19. Si autem Epiſcopale iudicium ab Imperatore poſtulauerit, nihil ei obſit. Lege Iuſtin. maj. Imperat. lib. 1. de Epiſcop. Leon. Epiſt. 38. Mar. Imperat. Theod. li. 5. c. 29.*

Cont.5.c.7 de ſolit.Eccleſ.

ers. This indeed was decreed in that Councell, as any one may finde it recorded in the Councell, *Can. 19. Placuit, vt quicunque ab Imperatore cognitionem publicorum iudiciorum petierit, honore proprio priuetur. &c.* To which Saint *Auſtin* ſubſcribed. And to that which you vrge *ex Epiſt. 162.* as alſo, *ex Epiſt. 166.* I anſwere, That in both places Saint *Auſtin* layes downe a plaine narration *de facto* what was done, but not a word *de iure factis*; playing the true Hiſtorian, hee relates word for word, what was enacted betweene *Caciliauus* and *Donatus*, but is himſelfe poſitiue on neither part; and therefore thoſe places ſerue nothing at all for this purpoſe.

To conclude all in a word, Saint *Auſtin* giues to the ſupreme Magiſtrate, actiue and coactiue power in matters of Religion, leauing to the Clergy paſsiue and directiue power; though the contrary opinion makes highly for your aduancement, (to be petty Kings free from all ſubiection) yet the truth is great, and muſt preuaile; for this was Saint *Auſtins* Religion, and is the Religion now taught in the Church of *England*, ſeconded by moſt of the ancient Fathers, where any one hauing leiſure to peruſe their Writings, may reade the ſame poſition. Saint *Bernards* meditation ſhall be my concluſion: *Omnis anima poteſtatibus ſublimioribus ſubdita ſit; ſi omnis, ergo & veſtra: quis vos excipit ab vniuerſalitate? ſi quis tentat excipere, conatur decipere: reddite igitur Cæſari, quæ ſunt Cæſaris, &c.* Let euery ſoule be ſubiect to the higher powers; if euery one, therefore yours: for who hath exempted you from the vniuerſall World? if any one ſtriue to ſeparate himſelfe, he endeuours to deceiue: Giue, therefore, to *Cæſar*, the things that are *Cæſars*, &c.

Ad. Archiepiſc. Senouenſ. Epiſt. 42.

CHAP.

Chap. V. §. I.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Sacraments doe conferre grace* ex opere operato?

Sine iſta ſanctificatione inuiſibilis gratiæ, viſibilia Sacramenta quid proſunt? nihil profuit Simoni Mago viſibilis Baptiſmus, cui ſanctificatio inuiſibilis defuit; Externall viſible ſignes (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) doe profit nothing, without inward inuiſible grace. From which words I gather this Syllogiſme or argument: If the outward elements in a Sacrament doe euer conferre grace to euery receiuer *ex opere operato*, then the viſible Sacrament, and the inuiſible ſanctification can neuer bee ſeparated; but in Saint *Auſtins* opinion they haue and may be ſeparated, (*Simoni adfuit viſibilis baptiſmus, inuiſibilis ſanctificatio defuit;*) *Simon Magus* was baptized externally, but wanted the inward and viſible ſanctification. Therefore (if Saint *Auſtin* muſt bee Iudge) they doe not euer conferre grace or ſanctification *ex opere operato*: a concluſion ſo plaine and euident, from that place and diuers others in Saint *Auſtin*, that I thinke no vnderſtanding Papiſt will deny it; but will ſtudy rather to maintaine this paradox, by the wreſted writings of ſome other Fathers. Belike, Maſter *Brereley* was vnlawfully ſworne, to proue Saint *Auſtin* a Papiſt, and therefore bound in his owne opinion to obey, elſe common modeſty had conſtrained him, in moſt of his Sections to haue confeſt Saint *Auſtin* his aduerſary: *ſed durum tibi videtur (Brerelee) traditiones parentum relinquere*; it is hard for you (Maſter *Brereley*) to leaue the traditions of your Fathers: eſpecially in this controuerſie, you haue changed away your ordinary ingenuity,

Auſt. Tom. 3. quæſt. ſup. Leuit. q. 84. Lib. 3. cont. lit. Petil. Donatiſt. c. vlt. Tract. 80. in Ioann. Ioh. Tract. 6 in Epiſt. Ioh.

nuity, for ſome ouer-audacious impudency, ſo groſſely to belye the Father, where his owne workes are plaine to the contrary: and your owne inferences from Saint *Auſtin* are gathered *adeò imperitè & ἀσυλλογίστως*, that any one-eyed Scholler may perceiue, that you thought it a glory to your ſelfe (in theſe erroneous times) *erràſſe ſtrenuè*, to erre ſtrongly. But to the queſtion, Saint *Auſtin* (you ſay) holds, that the Sacraments, as they are Sacraments, doe conferre grace to the receiuers, *ex opere operato*: his words are theſe; *Vnde iſta tanta virtus aquæ, vt corpus tangat, & cor ablnat, niſi faciente verbo? mundatio non fluxo & labili tribueretur elemento, niſi adderetur in verbo?* From whence is that great vertue of the water, that touching the body, it ſhould waſh the heart, but from the Word working? that cleanſing were not to be attributed to the vnſtable and flitting element, but that it is added in and by the Word. Where the Reader may perceiue, that *Auſtin* makes a plaine diſtinction betweene the outward element, and the inward operation of the ſpirit by the Word: and if any pleaſe to reade the whole Tract, hee ſhall finde many ſuch ſayings to this purpoſe: *Quare non ait, mundi eſtis propter baptiſmum quo loti eſtis* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*;) and therefore no grace contained in the outward element of Baptiſme: *Sed ait, Propter verbum quod ſum locutus vobis*; Wherefore hee doth not ſay, Yee are cleane for the Baptiſme wherewith ye are waſht, but, For the Word which I haue ſpoken vnto you. Grace comes by the operation of the ſpirit, not by power in the elements. Againe, *Detrahe verbum, & quid eſt aqua niſi aqua? accedat verbum ad elemẽtum, & fit Sacramentum*; Take away the Word, and what is the water but water? let the Word be ioyned to the element, and it is made a Sacrament. Conferring of grace is attributed to the Word, and not to the element vpon which the Word workes. To the ſame effect Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes in his fourth Booke *De Bapt. contr. Donatiſt. cap.* 23, 24, 25. *Ipſum Sacramentum* (ſaith he) *multũ valet, &c. inſtiando & recipiendo infantes in externũ electorũ cœtũ*; The Sacrament it ſelfe auailes much, in admitting and receiuing

Tom. 9. tract. 80. in Euang. Joh.

ceiuing young Infants into the outward aſſembly of the elect: But not to conferre grace *ad cordis conuerſionẽ*, to the conuerſion of the heart. And Saint *Auſtin* giues the reaſon: *Quia Baptiſmus poteſt eſſe, vbi cordis conuerſio deeſt, & è contra*: Baptiſme may be, where ſauing-grace neuer was; and ſauing-grace may be, where outward Baptiſme neuer was; becauſe, not the defect, but the contempt of a Sacrament *reatu hominem inuoluit*, doth condemne man, as Saint *Auſtin* there ſpeakes. Now, if the externall viſible element did conferre grace *ex opere operato*, the defect then muſt needes condemne men: but in Saint *Auſtins* opinion, the want of outward Sacraments doth not condemne men; therefore in his opinion they doe not conferre grace by the worke wrought: which is alſo the opinion of the Church of *England*: yet for the greater manifeſtation of the truth of this controuerſie, let the Reader take notice of theſe concluſions. Firſt, that outward elements, as they are elements, doe not principally conferre grace to the receiuer: *Detrahe verbum, & quid eſt aqua, niſi aqua?* Take away the Word, and what is the water but water? ſaith *Auſtin*. It is a common concluſion taught by the Schoolemen, againſt your deluding poſition. *Bonauent. in 4. ſent. diſt. 1. q. 3. Aquin. q. 62. art. 1. Suarin 3. part. Aqu. diſp. 7. Sect. 1.*

Secondly, they are cauſes morally inſtrumentall, by which meanes God hath decreed to conferre grace onely to the worthy receiuer, which none of our Church, to my knowledge, denyes. Some Schoolemen hold, that the elements in a Sacrament, finding a fit diſpoſed ſubiect, as they are inſtituted phyſicall agents, doe diſpoſe it better; that after the firſt grace, *gratia corroborans & confirmans*, ſtrengthening and confirming grace may be applyed. So *Aq. q. 27. art. 4. Capreol. q. 1. & Thom. de Argent. q. 1.* neyther would I contradict their opinion: but that the elements ſhould containe really in themſelues any, though imperfect quality, which can be *gratia cauſatiua*, an effectuall cauſer of grace, Saint *Auſtin*, and all ſound Diuines doe iuſtly deny: For, ſuppoſe ſuch a quality; it muſt either be ſpirituall: and then it were not connaturall nor inherent in the externall elements, but wrought in *ſubiecto capaci*,

capaci, in a capable ſubiect, by the principall agent: or materiall, and then there is no proportion betwixt it and grace, as there ought to be betweene the cauſe and the effect; for grace is a ſupernaturall forme, which no element doth containe, for then of neceſsitie it ſhould euer produce ſupernaturall acts, which you deny. It is a common axiome in Philoſophie, *Potentia naturalis extra ſphæram actiuitatis non eſt operatiua*, and therefore no innate qualitie in the elements can produce grace.

Cypr. de cæn. Dom. Sect. 7. Iuſt. Mart. Apol. 2. pro Chriſt. Ambroſ. Tom. 2. lib. 3. de Spirit. ſanct. c. 11. Grat. de Tœnit. cap. 4. Beuauent. in 4. Sent. diſt. 1. q. 3. Alan. de Sacram. cap. 31. & Hieron. comment. in 3. cap. ad Galat.

Laſtly, That the Sacraments doe conferre grace, *non potentibus obicem*: all vnbeleeuers *ponunt obicem*; ſo that the Sacraments doe conferre grace to beleeuers onely; and then not *ex opere operato*, leſt all thoſe which can accompliſh this *opus operatum*, ſhould equally participate of grace without the concurring act of faith, which your Schoolemen deny; nor *ex opere operantis*, vnleſſe you will call beleeuing, *opus operantis*. I grant, that the Sacraments haue (as euery phyſicall matter hath) *potentiam obedientialem*, an obeying power, inſtrumentally working that in the creature, to which they were ordayned by the Creator. So that if grace follow the receiuing, it muſt not be imputed to any innate quality in the elements (for that were to tye the free liberty of the Creator within the narrow limits of a creature) but onely to the ſpirit of GOD, working in and by thoſe elements: neyther doe I ſpeake this *ad decipiendos homines*, to deceiue men, (as your *Suarez* ſpeakes) but becauſe it is the ancient truth taught by Saint *Auſtin*, maintayned by the Church of *England*, and ſeconded by moſt of the primitiue Fathers; to whoſe workes, my intended breuity ſtill compels mee to referre the Readers, and to ſhut vp this Controuerſie with the words of Saint *Auſtin*: *Quomodò ergo Moyſes ſanctificat & Dominus? Non enim Moyſes pro Domino, ſed Moyſes viſibilibus Sacramentis per Miniſterium ſuum: Dominus autem inuiſibiliter gratiâ per ſpiritum ſanctum, vbi totus eſt fructus viſibilium Sacramentorum. ibid.* How does *Moyſes* ſanctifie, and the Lord? not *Moyſes* for the Lord; but *Moyſes* in viſible Sacraments by his miniſtery, but the Lord

Lord with inuiſible grace by his Spirit, wherein lies all the benefit of viſible Sacraments.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that certaine Sacraments doe imprint a character or any materiall marke in the ſoule of the receiuer?*

THat the Sacraments ſhould imprint a character in the ſoule of the receiuer, I could yet neuer reade in *Auſtin*, neither doe thoſe places which you alledge out of him, ſerue any thing at all for this purpoſe; for it is granted that Saint *Auſtin* cals baptiſme *Regius character*, the King of Heauens character; and *character Dominicus*, the Lords character; and laſtly, that hee cals it *character Imperatoris*, the Emperours character, (but this proues not any impreſsion of this character into the ſoule of man.) That as earthly Monarches (to vſe Saint *Auſtins* own Metaphore) doe giue to their Souldiers ſome certaine marke or character, whereby they may be diſtinguiſhed from others: euen ſo the great Emperour of all the world, giues to all his ſeeming and reall Souldiers, being either in or of the Campe, I meane the Church militant, this marke or character of Baptiſme, whereby they are knowne from all thoſe that are profeſt enemies to Chriſtianity: and this marke is indeleble, it cannot be put out, and therefore it ought not to bee iterated. This is all that Saint *Auſtin* meanes by this word [*Character.*] But that externall Baptiſme ſhould imprint any reall marke or character into the ſoule of the partie baptized, there's not a word in all Saint *Auſtin*: neither indeed can it, the ſoule being immateriall, and therefore not capable of a poſitiue action from any phyſicall agent. If there bee any marke left in the ſoule after baptiſme, it is that *obſignatio ſpiritus*, whereby wee are ſealed vnto the day of Redemption: beſides this, Saint *Auſtin* knowes none, nor the Church of *England*.

Lib 1. cont. Creſc. Gram. c. 3.
Lib. 6. de bapt. cont. Donat. c. 1.
Lib. 2. cont. lit. Petil. c. 11.

We are baptized with the ſame baptiſme Chriſt was; *Eodem fonte quo Chriſtus*, ſaith *Ambroſe*: but baptiſme did imprint no character in the humane ſoule of Chriſt, ſaith *Bellarmine*. No character was in Chriſt, ſaith *Aquinas*, neither ſhould it imprint any in vs. And *Scotus*, one of your moſt ancient Schoole-men, grants, that both Scripture and Fathers, eſpecially Saint *Auſtin*, haue made mention of this word [*Character*,] but that any Sacrament ſhould imprint a marke or character in the ſoule of man, hee ſayes truely, that it cannot be proued from Scripture, nor from any Father, therefore not from *Auſtin*.

Serm.41.

Lib.2.de effect. Sacram.c.19. propoſ.8.
Aq parte 3.q.63. art.5.
Durand.diſt.4. q.1.
Scotum diſt.6. q.9.
Gal.q.2.

How farre D. *Conell*, and that learned *Hooker* haue allowed of this marke or character, it is not pertinent to our preſent purpoſe, ſince wee are to deale with none but Saint *Auſtin*, whoſe opinion ſhall ſhut vp this controuerſie. *Attendo fidem, in nomine Patris, Filij, & Sp. ſancti: iſte eſt character Imperatoris mei, &c.* cited by *Bellarmine, lib. 2. de effect. Sacram. c. 21.* I haue reſpect to the faith, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt: that is the character of my Emperour.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that there are ſeuen Sacraments?*

HEe that deſires truely to vnderſtand Saint *Auſtin* and the reſt of the Fathers in this Controuerſie, muſt firſt be acquainted with a common Schoole-diſtinction, which makes a difference between *Sacramentale*, *Sacrum*, and *Sacramentum*. All thoſe things are called *Sacra & Sacramentalia*, which ſerue as precedent preparatiues for the receiuing of a Sacrament, whether they appertaine to the eſſence, to the effect, or to the ſigne of the Sacrament: neither of which be properly Sacraments; and yet Saint *Auſtin* and other Fathers, vſing this word (Sacrament) in a generall ſenſe, haue called them Sacraments, although

Lege Aug.lib.19. cont.Fauſt.Man. c.13.
Expoſit.epiſt.Ioh. tract.3.
Lib.4.de Symb. c.1.
Enarrat in Pſal. 73.

although indeed they be but *ſacramentalia*, or things ordained to a ſacred end. Now *ſacramentum* properly is that which conſiſts of externall viſible ſignes, and internall inuiſible grace, hauing Chriſts immediate inſtitution for its approbation; for a Sacrament can bee inſtituted by none but by Chriſt onely; taking a Sacrament in this ſence, conſidering it ſomething diſtinct *à ſacro & ſacramentali*. Saint *Auſtin* ſayes in diuers places, that there are but two onely: *Quædam panca pro multis, facta facillima, intellectu angustissima, & obseruatione castissima, sicuti est baptismi sacramentum, & celebratio corporis & sanguinis Domini*; Some few for many, in doing moſt eaſie, in vnderſtanding moſt holy, and in obſeruing moſt pure and honeſt, as the Sacrament of Baptiſme and the Lords Supper. Where hee ſets downe two Sacraments, not onely for example, (as *Bellarmine* interprets it euen againſt his owne knowledge) *ſed pro numeri veritate*, for the truth of the number. The Iewes (ſaith hee) had many, Chriſtians haue onely theſe two; where any meane Scholler may ſee, that this Doctrine is not exemplary, but poſitiue; confirmed in his tract *de ſymbolo ad Catech:* but moſt plainely in his 118. Epiſtle *ad Ianuar. cap. 1. Vnde ſacramentis numero pauciſſimis, obſeruatione facillimis, ſignificatione præſtantiſſimis, ſicuti eſt baptiſmus, & communicatio corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, &c.* With Sacraments in number feweſt, in obſeruation eaſieſt, and in ſignification moſt excellent, as Baptiſme and the Lords Supper. If Chriſt did inſtitute *ſacramenta numero pauciſſima*, he did then inſtitute but two onely, which is the leaſt number, but our Sauiour Chriſt, in Saint *Auſtins* opinion, did ordaine *ſacramenta numero pauciſſima*, Sacraments in number feweſt; therefore but two. *Iuſtine*, who writ one hundred and ſixty yeeres after Chriſt, knew of no more in his ſecond Apology *pro Chriſtianis*; nor *Ambroſe* in his ſixe Bookes *de Sacramentis*. So that it is moſt certaine, that none of the Fathers did determine this number of ſeuen Sacraments, before *Peter Lumbard* writ his Sentences which was 1160. yeeres after Chriſt, and 760. yeeres after Saint *Auſtin*; nor any Coun-

Tom. 3. lib. 3. de doct. Chriſt. c. 9.

Lege Tertul. lib. 1. cont. Marcion. Cyril. in Catech. de Sacram. Paſchaſ. de cœn. Dom. Bed. lib. 6. in Luc. c. 24. Durand. lib 4. diſt. 26. q. 3. Can. lib. 8. cap. 5. Alexan. Hal. par. 4. q. 5.

Councell before the *Florentine* Councell, which was at leaſt three hundred yeeres after *Lumbard*. Thus, you ſee, it is but a humane inuention, vnknowne to the ancient Fathers, forged and maintayned by the lately hatcht order of Ieſuites; who are ſworne to maintaine what-euer the Pope decrees, without any reſpect to truth or Antiquitie.

For reſolution to your obiections, I anſwere, That Saint *Auſtin* calls Chryſme a Sacrament, taking the word Sacrament *non pro ſigillo fœderis*, not for a ſeale of the Couenant betweene God and man, *ſed pro ſacro vel Sacramentali*, for an externall ceremony, practized by ſome particular Churches in his time, for ſome ſacred end: For, (ſaith he) it doth not belong *nec ad barbam Aaronis, nec ad oram veſtimenti, nec ad vllam contextionem veſtis Sacerdotalis*; neither to the beard of *Aaron*, nor to the skirt of his cloathing, nor to any part of the Prieſts garment. In the ſame ſence he calls Ordination a Sacrament; and the like you may reade elſe-where of Matrimony; both which are indeed really *ſacra* and *ſacramentalia*, but not Sacraments properly in that ſtrict ſence, in which the word is taken by the Church of *England*: Neyther doth *Dionyſius*, nor that ſuppoſed worke of *Cyprian* proue any thing to the contrary; for if this word Sacrament be taken in a large and improper ſence (as Saint *Auſtin* and moſt of the Fathers vſed it, whoſe names are mentioned in the Margent) then it is not abſurd to ſay that there are many Sacraments, but if you take it in a more ſtrict and proper ſence (as it is before defined) then there are but two onely; which is the ancient primitiue truth taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and maintained by the Church of *England*; what-euer is contrary to this, is new, and therefore hereticall: hereafter (louing Countrimen) be not deluded, and ſo drawne from the Catholique truth to beleeue nouelties, onely by the name of *Auſtin*, or of the Fathers, as though wee taught any poynt of faith contradicted by them; there is yet no difference you ſee betweene the Church of *England*, and Saint *Auſtin*, whoſe Analogie in his 15. Tract vpon *Iohn*, ſhall

Ambroſ. lib. 3. de Sacra. c. 1. Bernard. ſer. 1. de adu. Dom. & ſerm. de cœn. Dom.

Artic. Eccleſ. Aug. 25.

ſhall end this controuerſie: *Ex latere Domini dormientis in cruce profluxerunt Sacramenta Eccleſiæ*; The Sacraments of the Church did flow from the ſide of our Lord, ſleeping on the Croſſe: which were but two, Water and Bloud, to be the matter of two Sacraments (Baptiſme and the Lords Supper:) Which is alſo the Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Sacraments are to be adminiſtred with the ſigne of the Croſſe?*

FOr the firſt hundred yeeres after Chriſt, there was no mention made of ſigning with the ſigne of the Croſſe; and when Chriſt inſtituted his Sacraments, he made no mention of the ſigne of the Croſſe, ſaith *Alphonſus*; *Neque Apoſtoli ea de re à Chriſto acceperunt mandatum*; neyther did the Apoſtles receiue any commandement from Chriſt concerning the Croſſe, ſay the Centuriſts: It was firſt mentioned by *Tertullian*, two hundred and tenne yeeres after Chriſt; and after, by *Grig.* two hundred and ſixteene yeres after Chriſt. For the deciding of therfore this Controuerſie, we muſt touch two things: firſt, what Saint *Auſtin* teaches about the vſe of ſigning with the ſigne of the Croſſe: ſecondly, of the abuſing of this ſigne of the Croſſe. Concerning the vſe thereof, (though *Cyprian*, and after him *Hierome*, doe goe about to proue it from the ninth of *Ezech. verſ.* 4.) there is not one word directly in Scripture: neyther was it receyued in the Church, till one hundred and ſixty yeeres after Chriſt; the Author thereof, as ſome report, was one *Valentinus*, who comming to *Rome*, ſtayed there twelue yeeres, and brought vp this vſe of the Croſſe, as *Irenæus* reports: but ſure, it could be to no good end, comming from ſo bad an Author. And that may be the reaſon why it was ſo quickly

Cent. 1. lib. 2. cap. 6. Lib. de Reſur. carn. & Orig. hom. 2. in Pſal. 38.

forgotten, till about two hundred yeeres after, it was reuiued by *Conſtantine* the Great, to a commendable end; for the Chriſtian World beeing almoſt ouer-whelmed with Arrianiſme and Donatiſme, *Conſtantine* ſuppreſſed them, and gaue Chriſtians liberty to breathe; vpon this, thoſe Heretiques derided the Chriſtians for adoring a crucified God, (as the Turke lately did the King of *Polonia*:) Whereupon, the Emperour commanded them to weare the ſigne of the Croſſe in their Hats or foreheads, to tell thoſe Heretiques, that they were ſo farre from being aſhamed of the Croſſe, as that their chiefeſt glory was in Chriſt crucified; and this was the end in the firſt inſtitution of it, as Saint *Auſtin* teſtifies in his Booke *de Catechiſ. rudib. cap.* 20. But a little after, in the Reigne of *Gratian* and *Valentinian*, it begun to be vſed after Baptiſme, not as a part of a Baptiſme, but onely as an externall token in that infancy of the Church, to teach them that they ſhould not be aſhamed of Chriſt crucified. This Decree beeing made by the Emperour, and confirmed by the Church, cauſed Saint *Auſtin* to ſay, that without this ſigne, *non ritè perficitur Sacramentum*, the Sacrament was not rightly performed; and the reaſon is, becauſe that that conformity (which the Church challenges to her ſelfe in matters of indifferency) without it, would bee wanting; the Church enioyning it without contradiction from the written Word of God. Now where the lawfull ceremonies of the Church are left out, there *non ritè perficitur Sacramentum*, the Sacrament is not rightly performed. Which is all that euer Saint *Auſtin* taught about the vſe of the ſigne of the Croſſe; and the ſame is maintained by the Church of *England*.

So did *Amurath* in his Letters to *Rodolph* the Second.

Secondly, concerning the abuſing of the ſigne of the Croſſe, (making it an eſſentiall part of Baptiſme, and the cauſe expulſiue, to driue away the Deuill) it came in long after the death of Saint *Auſtin*: for firſt they made Croſſes of Gold, and ſet them in their Churches and Highwayes; in honour (as it may be probably and charitably coniectured) of Chriſt; but preſently the ignorant Laitie

(dazeled

(dazeled with the glistering glory of an exalted Crosse) fell to idolatry; to adore the Crosse, and to bow to Crosses, as they did to Christ; which being perceiued by some of your Schoolemen, they brought vp a strange kinde of Doctrine, neuer heard of in Saint *Austins* time, nor many yeeres after, concerning the necessity of adoring the Crosse, which is flat idolatry, and all that vse it are idolaters: this abuse of the signe of the Crosse beeing lately crept into the Church of *Rome*, (inuented maintayned, and fostered by the adorers of idolatry) is not mentioned by Saint *Austin*; he thought that the Diuel himselfe could not haue driuen this Heresie into the hearts of men. The second abuse is in attributing a certaine vertue to the externall signe of the Crosse, as to keepe them safe from euill spirits, to protect them from the Thunder, to sanctifie their hearts for prayer and hearing the Word of God, and the like, which ought not to bee attributed to any thing, but to the bloud of Christ: That the outward signing with the signe of the Crosse, made with the hand or fingers vpon the breft, face, or forehead, is insufficient to doe any of these things, it is Saint *Austins* owne opinion in plaine termes: *Signum Christi à nobis repellit exterminatorem, si cor nostrum recipiat Saluatorem*: the externall signe of the Crosse is not operatiue: *frontes signantur sanguine Christi*; our foreheads must bee signed with the bloud of Christ, as Saint *Austin* there speakes: And a little after; *Ideò dixi, fratres, quod repeto; Signũ Christi à nobis repellit exterminatorem* (conditionally) *si cor nostrum habeat Christum habitatorem*; Therefore I said (Brethren) what I now repeat; That the signe of Christ doth repell from vs the Diuell, if Christ himselfe dwell in our hearts. Thus you see that Saint *Austin* thought it an abuse to impute any vertue to the outward signe of the Crosse, in crosing the breft, face, or forehead, and giues the effectuall operation to the bloud of him that dyed vpon the Crosse. If Christ dwell within, Satan cannot hurt without; and this is all that Saint *Austin* teaches about the signe of the Crosse, which is also practized by the Church of *England*;

Tom. 9. tract. 50. in Euang. Ioh.

vsing the signe of the Crosse after baptisme, without which Baptisme is not rightly performed according to the Churches institution.

Hom. 55. in Matth. To that of *Chrysostome* I answere, that all things which helpe to saluation, are perfected by the Crosse (.i.) *per virtutem Crucis*, by the death and passion of Christ vpon the Crosse, as Saint *Paul* spoke before him, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. neither is this contradicted by any iudicious Diuine that euer I read. To conclude then, it is most certaine, that the signe of the Crosse was first inuented, and practised against Pagans, who vsed to make it onely in derision of Christianity; which was a particular occasion proper to that age; so that now we being freed from the company of Infidels, it is not necessary to continue the practice of it for that end. Secondly, Saint *Austin* thought, that seeing the signe of the Crosse had a lawfull institution, & was ordayned by the Church to be a signe or token of mans militancy against the enemies of his soule, it might and ought (especially in that infancy of the Church, there being lesse need in this maturity) to be lawfully vsed; but to make it a part of Baptisme, as though Baptisme were not perfect without it, was then, and is now vnlawfull. If the Word of Christ dwell in our hearts, we may vse or not vse the signe of the Crosse, saue when and where the Church commands it, without endangering our saluation: but I am afraid, I may conclude of most in your Church, as Saint *Austin* did of many in his time; *Facilè habent in fronte signum Christi, & corde non recipiunt Verbum Christi*; They are exceeding willing to haue the Crosse of Christ in their foreheads, but they will not receiue the Word of Christ into their hearts.

Tom. 9. tract. 50. in Euang. Ioh.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Baptiſme takes away all ſinnes, both originall and actuall?*

THat the externall element in Baptiſme takes away any ſinnes actuall or originall, Saint *Auſtin* denyes, as I haue already proued; but that the Sacrament of Baptiſme (vnderſtanding the outward element, and the inward operation of the Spirit) doth take away all ſinnes originall and actuall, is maintained by the Church of *England*, in the ſeuen and twentieth Article of her Religion; and ſeconded by Saint *Auſtin* in his third Booke *cont. duas Epiſt. Pelag. cap. 3. Baptiſmus quidem abluit omnia peccata, factorum, dictorum, &c.* Baptiſme waſhes away all ſinnes: originall, *actu præſenti*, in the preſent act: and actuall, *ſpe futura*, in future hope, as he explaines himſelfe in the ſame Chapter: *Quiſquis baptiſmati derogat, corrumpit fidem; quiſquis autem nunc ei tribuit, quod quidem per ipſum, ſed tamen poſtea accepturi ſumus, amputat ſpem:* Hee that derogates from Baptiſme, corrupts the faith, and he that attributes any thing to baptiſme in the preſent act, which we are to receiue by Baptiſme, but afterwards, cuts off hope. So that he which attributes the waſhing away of that which is not (I mean) of ſinnes to come, to the outward act of Baptiſme *de facto in præſenti, non potius faciendo in futuro*, in Saint *Auſtins* opinion, *ſpem amputare conatur*, hee endeuours to cut off hope. Which ouerthrowes that opinion of the Meſſalians, who held, that ſinnes future were not cleanſed by Baptiſme, neither in act nor expectation. And to this purpoſe doe the Centuriſts and *Chemnitius* alledge Saint *Auſtin*, none of them differing from the tenent of the Church of *England:* That Baptiſme takes away all ſinnes, both originall

Cap. 5. Sect. 1. huius libri.

nall and actuall; the one actually in the preſent, the other really in the future, if we ſatisfie Chriſts obligation, the condition whereof is repentance: For if any one aske me, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*, *Vtrum per idem lauacrum, omni prorſus modo nos fecerit ſaluos? Reſpondebo, Non ita eſt, &c.* Whether he doth ſaue vs by one and the ſame act of baptiſme? I anſwere, It is not ſo. Without faith and and repentance, the outward act of the Church doth little auaile.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that concupiſcence remaining after Baptiſme, be a ſinne?*

THe Doctrine of the Church of *England*, concerning this queſtion, is contained in the ninth Article of her Religion: That this infection of nature remaines in the regenerate after baptiſme, whereby the luſt of the fleſh, called φρόνημα σαρκὸς, is not ſubiect to the Law of God: and although there be no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Ieſus; yet concupiſcence in them, hath of it ſelfe the true nature of ſinne. This very Doctrine is confirmed by Saint *Auſtin*, where hee purpoſely handles this queſtion, and therefore he is more to be credited in that place, then in any other: his words are theſe: If any one ſhall aske me (ſaith he) how concupiſcence remaines in the regenerate; *ad hæc reſpondetur; Dimitti concupiſcentiam in baptiſmo, non vt non ſit, ſed vt in peccatum non imputetur*: Concupiſcence is taken away in baptiſme, not ſimply from beeing, but from being imputed. You cannot deſire a plainer anſwer, neither haue I read a more plaine poſition in all *Auſtin*. So that if you hold, that concupiſcence is waſhed away in baptiſme, both *ab actu entetatiuo & imputatiuo*, from being and being imputed, you contradict Saint *Auſtin*: (*dimittitur, non vt ſit, ſed vt non imputetur*; it is taken away, not from being, but from being imputed) and if you hold, that concupiſcence, after baptiſme, is not ſinne,

Tom. 7. lib. 1. de nupt. & concu. c. 25.

ſinne, onely becauſe it ſhall not be imputed as a ſinne to the regenerate, then you differ not at all from the tenent of the Church of *England*, before cited: ſo that you muſt of neceſsity either contradict Saint *Auſtin*, or elſe conclude nothing againſt the Church of *England*. Againe, to hold that there were no ſinne at all in the regenerate, were to maintaine that hereſie of the *Pelagians*, *Browniſts*, *Anabaptiſts*, and other Libertines; That a man may attaine to the ſtate of perfection in this life. Which cauſed *Conſtantine* to deride a Nouation Biſhop: *Appoſitis ſcalis in Cœlum, tu ſolus aſcende*: Set vp a ladder to heauen, and goe thou vp alone, ô Biſhop; becauſe thou onely art pure from ſinne, when all men elſe are ſinners. The Church of *England* ſaies, That concupiſcence in a regenerate man is truely ſinne, but not imputed to them as ſinne. And ſo ſayes Saint *Auſtin*: *Dimittitur, non vt non ſit, ſed vt in peccatum non imputetur*: It is taken away, not from being, but from being imputed. Mr. *Brereley* ſayes, that concupiſcence in a regenerate man is no ſinne; making good that title which hee ſeemes to be glad of; That a true Papiſt is a true Puritane, pure from ſinne.

To your obiection. Where Saint *Auſtin* ſaies, that concupiſcence is now no ſinne in the regenerate; I anſwere with Saint *Auſtin*: That it is now no ſinne in them, becauſe the guilt of it is not imputed to them as ſinne: for ſo he expounds himſelfe in the 26. Chapter following: *Hoc eſt enim non habere peccatum, reum non eſſe peccati*; The regenerate may be ſaid to haue no ſinne, becauſe the guilt of euery ſinne is waſht away. To haue no ſinne (in Saint *Auſtins* language) is to be guilty of no ſinne. So in his firſt Booke *cont. Iulian. Pelag.* c. 5. A regenerate man *caret omni peccato*, is without all ſinne: that is, (ſaith he) *omni reatu omnium peccatorum caret*, wants the guilt of euery ſinne. And in his Booke *de peccat. merit. & remiſſ.* c. 4. hee ſayes, That the guilt of concupiſcence is waſht away in baptiſme, but the eſſence remaines for the Combate. Which is all one with that which is taught in the Church of *England*: ſo that yet there is no difference in Religion betweene

Tom. 7. lib. 1. de nupt. & concu. c. 23.

tweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*. To conclude then, there is a two-fold concupiſcence; the firſt is *naturalis*, naturall, which flowes partly from the appetite vegetatiue, and partly from the ſenſitiue, as to deſire meate, drinke, &c. and this is no ſinne. The ſecond is *vitioſa & deprauata*, a vicious and depraued concupiſcence, which is a ſinne remaining in the regenerate, but is not imputed as a ſinne, becauſe it was pardoned in the death of Chriſt. *Contra hunc reatum, Chriſti gratia valeri non ſinit*: Againſt the guilt of this ſinne, the grace of Chriſt doth not ceaſe to bee of force, ſaith *Auſtin*. It is moſt true, he that is borne of God, doth not commit ſinne willingly or of ſet purpoſe: for, *peccare* is one thing, and *peccatum facere*, another: *peccare, pradicat infirmitatem*, but *peccatum facere, implicat velleitatem*; to ſinne, doth ſhew an infirmity, to doe ſinne, doth imply a willingneſſe. No ſinne is able actually to condemne them, who are waſht in the bloud of the Lambe of God: now the guilt of concupiſcence is waſht away in his bloud, that it ſhall neuer be imputed as a ſinne to condemne the Elect; but the nature of it remaines in them for the Combate, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes in the place before cited; as alſo *in lib. 1. Retract. c. 15. Carnis concupiſcentiæ reatus in baptiſmate ſoluitur, ſed infirmitas manet; cui donec ſanetur, omnis fidelis qui benè proficit, ſtudioſiſſimè reluctatur*: The guilt of concupiſcence is taken away in baptiſme, but the infirmity remaines; againſt which, till it be cured, euery faithfull man, that goes on well, doth moſt painefully ſtriue. Which is the ancient Catholike truth, taught by Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

SECT. 3.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Children dying without baptiſme cannot be ſaued?*

IT is the common tenent of our *Engliſh* Diuines, That thoſe children, whom God in his eternall Councel hath elected, dying without the outward act of baptiſme, are ſaued. Now that Saint *Auſtin* was of the ſame opinion, I ſhall (by Gods aſsiſtance) make it very manifeſt: for firſt of all it is an Axiome in Saint *Auſtin*, that *Contemptus*, and not *defectus Sacramenti damnat*: Not want, but contempt of a Sacrament doth condemne a man: vpon which he builds all his poſitions concerning baptiſme; as appeares: For, ſaith hee, *Conuerſio cordis poteſt ineſſe, non percepto baptiſmo, ſed contempto non poteſt*: Conuerſion of the heart may bee, where baptiſme is not receiued, but where it is contemned it cannot. In S. *Auſtins* opinion, a man may bee ſaued without the receiuing of baptiſme, if hee contemne it not: and therfore, in his iudgement, a child dying vnbaptized, not contemning baptiſme, may be ſaued. And in his third Booke *de libero arbit. c.* 23. he giues the reaſon why, and how they may be ſaued: ſaying, that *fides aliena poteſt conſulere paruulo, cui propria perfidia non poteſt imputari*: Therefore I ſee no reaſon why Saint *Auſtin* ſhould be entituled *Rigidus infantum cenſor*; A ſharp and ſeuere Iudge of Infants: let none hereafter ſo cenſure him, before he reade him and vnderſtand him, by comparing one place with another. It is a cruell opinion, peculiar onely to Ieſuites, ſo vncharitably to condemne all poore innocents to hell, that dye without outward baptiſme of the Church: Saint *Auſtin* durſt not doe it, nor the Church of *England*.

Lib. 4. de bapt. cont. Don. c. 25.

For the better and more facile vnderſtanding of this queſtion, I would willingly acquaint the Reader with 3. ſorts of Baptiſme, mentioned (not vnprofitably) by the

Schoolemen, with which hee muſt needes be acquainted, before he can rightly vnderſtand the Fathers, eſpecially Saint *Auſtin*, in this controuerſie. The firſt is *Baptiſmus fluminis*, that externall and corporall baptiſme which is vſed in all Chriſtian Churches; either *per immerſionem*, or *per aſpertionem*; by dipping the child ouer head and eares, or by ſprinkling him on the face; either lawfull; as the Church wherein we liue ſhall determine. That this baptiſme is not abſolutely neceſsary to ſaluation, Saint *Auſtin* is very plaine: For if a man may be ſaued, *cui corporaliter baptiſmus deeſt*, to whom this corporall baptiſme is wanting, then this corporall baptiſme is not abſolutely neceſſary to ſaluation; but the thiefe on the Croſſe was ſaued, *cui corporaliter baptiſmus defuit*; who wanted this corporall baptiſme, as Saint *Auſtin* teſtifies: therefore, in his opinion, a Child may be ſaued, dying without this kind of baptiſme: which plainely contradicts the opinion of the Church of *Rome*, that this baptiſme ſhould be ſo neceſſary to ſaluation, as that without it, a child cannot be ſaued; a doctrine contrary to all antiquity, contrary to Saint *Auſtin*, and the Church of *England*.

Tom. 7. lib. 4. de bapt. cont. Donat. c. 23.

The ſecond is *baptiſmus ſanguinis*, which is miniſtred to none but to true Martyrs, who are willing to ſhead their bloud in defence of their Sauiour: all Gods Saints are thus baptized *preparatiuè*, but not all *actualiter*; no man euer dreamed that ſhould bee neceſſary to ſaluation; becauſe many are now Saints in heauen, which were neuer actually Martyrs vpon earth: therefore Children dying without this Baptiſme, may be ſaued.

The third is *Baptiſmus flũminis*, which is a fit preparation of the heart, for the receiuing of ſauing grace; and this is ſimply neceſſary to ſaluation, without which none can be ſaued. With this baptiſme, elected Saints of ripe yeeres are baptized really and actually; elected infants are baptized with it onely really and habitually: ſo that an Infant dying without all baptiſme cannot be ſaued. Theſe termes beeing thus explained, it may bee granted, that all theſe kinds of baptiſme are neceſſary. The firſt of theſe is neceſ-

ſary,

ſary to ſaluation, *neceſſitate præcepti & medij ordinarij externi*, by reaſon of the commandement, and of the ordinary outward means to ſaluation. The ſecond is neceſſary, *neceſſitate ſuppoſitiua*, by a ſuppoſitiue neceſsity; if a man be called by Chriſt, he ought not to refuſe it. The laſt is neceſſary, *neceſſitate ſimplici & abſoluta*, by a ſimple and abſolute neceſsity. So Saint *Auſtin* ſayes in diuers places, that a child dying without this baptiſme, can neuer enter into heauen. Now to your obiections I anſwere, (and becauſe they all aime at one and the ſame end) Ile anſwer to one for all, *ex Tom. 7. lib. 3. de anim. & eius orig. c. 9. Noli credere, noli dicere, nec docere, Infantes antequam baptizentur, &c.* Where, by (*baptizari*) Saint *Auſtin* vnderſtands, *renaſci in Chriſto*, as he expounds himſelfe in the Chapter following; as alſo in his ſecond Booke of his *Retractations*, c. 45. *Paruuli niſi regenerentur in Chriſto, ſine dubitatione damnantur:* vnleſſe children be baptized with the laſt kind of baptiſme aboue mentioned, vnleſſe they bee partakers of the new birth in Chriſt, it is impoſsible for them to obtain remiſsion of their originall impurity. Neither is there any Proteſtant that contradicts this opinion of Saint *Auſtin*.

That this which I haue ſpoken, may more eaſily be vnderſtood of the ignorant Laity, (whoſe iudgements I deſire to rectifie, and to free their vnderſtandings from the ſlauery of ignorance,) Ile containe the whole in a few concluſions, (a method moſt agreeable to their capacities.)

Firſt, that the outward act of corporall baptiſme with materiall water, is not abſolutely neceſſary to ſaluation. This is taught by all the Diuines in *England*; with whom agrees S. *Auſtin* in his 4. Booke againſt the Donatiſts, c. 23. where he diuides baptisme into corporall and ſpirituall baptiſme: and ſpeaking of one that was ſaued without baptiſme, applyes his owne diſtinction; ſaying, That the corporall baptiſme was wanting, but the ſpirituall baptiſme was preſent. Which diſtinction of his, is to be conſidered, for the right vnderſtanding of him in his other workes. So the trueſt Schoole-Diuine, diuiding baptiſme into mentall and ſacramentall, ſayes, That the want of Sacramentall *Aquin. part. 3. ſum. q. 68. art. 2.*

cramentall baptiſme in act onely, doth not condemne any. They were Hereticks which taught the contrary, ſaith *Suarez*. It was a vaine opinion of the *Pelagians*, ſaith *Greg. de Valent.* Therefore let no ſecular Prieſt hereafter goe about to make the ignorant beleeue that, which their owne Clergie doe not beleeue: For outward baptiſme, by their owne confeſsion, is not abſolutely neceſſary to ſaluation.

Suar. tom. 3. in 3. part. Aqui. q. 69. art. 8. ſect. 2.

Greg. de Valent. tom. 3. in ſecunda ſecundæ Aqui. diſ. 1. q 2. pun. 4. pag. 407.

Secondly, that children dying without this Baptiſme, may be ſaued, the truth of this concluſion neceſſarily depends vpon the former: for if corporall baptiſme may bee wanting, (as both *Auſtin* and your own Schoole-men haue acknowledged) and yet damnation not follow, (*modò abſit contemptus*, ſo that we doe nor contemne it;) then it muſt needs be granted, that it is not abſolutely neceſſary to ſaluation; and conſequently, a child dying without it, may be ſaued.

Lege Bernardum epiſt. 77.

If you read Saint *Auſtin* with an impartiall iudgement, you could not ſlander that Father with ſuch an vncharitable opinion, as to exclude all thoſe children out of Heauen, which dye without this externall act of baptiſme, when it befals them, *non Sacramenti contemptu, ſed temporis neceſſitate*, not through contempt of the Sacrament, but for want of time: For, *Quis nouit* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) *quid bona compenſationis reſeruet Deus pro ipſis paruulis in ſecreto iudiciorum ſuorum?* Who knowes what good reward God reſerues for little Children, in the depth of his Iudgement? Who knowes what God reſerues for little infants? or who dares pry into the Cabinet of his ſecrets? Doe not condemne them, leſt thou thy ſelfe be condemned: Gods mercy may ſupply the want of baptiſme; *ſicut in illo latrone, qua ex baptiſmi Sacramento defuerat, compleuit Omnipotentis bonignitas; quia non ſuperbia, vel contemptu, ſed neceſſitate defuerat: ſic in in infantibus qui non baptizati moriuntur, eadem gratia Omnipotentis, implere, credenda eſt*; ſaith Saint *Auſtin*: euen as it was in that Thiefe on the Croſſe, what was wanting of the Sacrament of Baptiſme, Gods mercy did accompliſh; becauſe it was wanting not through pride,

Lib. 3. de libero arbit. c. 23.

Lib. 4. de bapt. cont. Donat. c. 24.

or

or contempt, but of neceſsitie. The ſame is to be beleeued of Infants which dye vnbaptized.

Thirdly, that thoſe Children which dye, both without corporall and ſpirituall Baptiſme, cannot be ſaued; none can be ſaued, vnleſſe they bee members incorporate into the body of Chriſt: *& nemo fit membrum Chriſti, niſi aut Baptiſmate in Chriſto, aut morte pro Chriſto*; and no man is made a member of Chriſt, but by ſome kinde of Baptiſme, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. *Tom.7.lib.1.de anim. & eius ori.ad Renat.c.9.*

Fourthly, it is not conuenient that Baptiſme ſhould be deferred, leſt the deferring beget careleſneſſe, neglect, or contempt of the ordinary outward meanes.

Laſtly, that there is no ſuch abſolute neceſsitie of outward Baptiſme, as that a Layman or woman ought to baptize; which contradicts Maſter *Brereleyes* laſt poſition. Now that Saint *Auſtin* was of this opinion, it is manifeſt: For (ſaith he) if a Lay-man or woman ſhould baptize, *non poteſt dici non datum, non baptizatũ, quamuis rectè dici poteſt illicitè datum*: it cannot be called no Baptiſme, but it may be called an vnlawfull Baptiſme: though they performe the action, yet they doe it vnlawfully: S. *Auſtin* indeed puts a caſe of neceſsitie not abſolute to ſaluation, but apparent onely and ſuppoſitiue: When the want of outward Baptiſme (the Childe being ready to depart) may cauſe ſcruple of conſcience, and ſtirre vp deſpairing doubts in the weake but beleeuing parents, then for a Lay-man to baptize, in *Auſtins* opinion, is a pardonable ſinne. Firſt, you ſee, it is vnlawfull, it is a ſin, & the vſurping of another mans office (as S. *Auſtin* here ſpeakes) and therefore it ought not to be done: The Mother of Chriſt could not baptize, *alioqui potuiſſet Chriſtus ab ipſa baptizari, potius quã à Iohanne*, otherwiſe Chriſt might haue been baptized of her, rather than of *Iohn*, ſaith *Epiphanius*. *Tertullian* did deride the *Marcioniſts* for committing the office of the Prieſt to the Laity, ſaith *Bellarmine*; to baptize belongs onely to the Prieſts, ſaith *Theodoret*. That Women ſhould baptize, there is no example for the firſt foure hundred yeeres after Chriſt, ſay the Centuriſts. It was forbidden in- *Lib.2.cont.Epiſt. Parmen.c.13.* *Lib.3. contr.hæreſ.79.* *Lib.4.de ſacram. Euchariſt.c.16.* *Lib.2.cap.27.* *Cent.4.cap.6.*

the fourth Councell at Carthage, whereunto Saint *Auſtin* ſubſcribed; all which doe confirme the truth of the concluſion, that there is no ſuch neceſsity of corporall Baptiſme, as that a Lay-man or Woman ought to baptize.

And here (courteous Reader) thou haſt the ſumme and ſubſtance of this controuerſie; which I dare maintaine, if God enable mee, againſt all oppoſers, to be the ancient Catholique truth, taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and maintayned by the Church of *England*, that *conuerſio cordis ſine baptiſmo poteſt eſſe in Infante, complente Deo quod non ex voluntate deeſt*; conuerſion of the heart, ſpirituall baptiſme, or the new birth, may be in an Infant without corporall Baptiſme, God ſupplying that with mercy, which is wanting of neceſsity; let no Prieſt, ſecular nor Ieſuit, perſwade thee the contrary, but examine what hath beene deliuered, impartially, and the Lord giue thee vnderſtanding to beleeue the truth: for yet there is no difference in Religion betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach all or moſt of the Ceremonies of Baptiſme now vſed in the Romane Church?*

THat the true Church hath authority to decree rites or Cermonies, is taught by the Church of *England*, *Articulo* 20. So that the Church of *Rome* may vſe many Ceremonies, and the Church of *England* a few, and yet neyther of them in this ouerturne the foundation of faith: but the queſtion in hand is, Whether Saint *Auſtin* teach thoſe ſundry ceremonies of Baptiſme now vſed in the Romane Church. That he mentions ſome ceremonies, I neuer heard it denyed; but that hee names all or halfe with approbation, is an erroneous aſſertion, diſperced

perſed abroad by Maſter *Brereley*: the confutation wherof in this briefe Diſcourſe may ſerue to direct thoſe that wander for want of knowledge to a ſettled reſolution. In the Primitiue Church, Ceremonies about Baptiſme were of three ſorts.

The firſt ſort went before Baptiſme; and thoſe eyther concerning the Font or the perſon to be baptized: concerning the Font you haue diuers ceremonies, which were neuer thought of the Primitiue Church, and in common reaſon are ignominiouſly branded as ſuperſtitious.

For example. Firſt, for the Prieſt to deuide the water with his hand in manner of a Croſſe. Secondly, to touch the water with his hand. Thirdly, to make Croſſes vpon the Font. Fourthly, to deuide the water, and ſprinkle it into foure parts of the World. Fiftly, to change his voyce. Sixtly, to breathe three times vpon the water in manner of a Croſſe. Seuenthly, to put a Wax Candle into the water. Eightly, to pull it forth, and put it in deeper. Ninthly, to pull it forth, and put it into the bottome. Tenthly, to blow thrice vpon the water. Eleuenthly, then to take the Waxe Candle out of the water. Twelfthly, to ſprinkle that water vpon the people; making the people to beleeue it is Holy-water, able to expell Deuils. Thirteenthly, to poure in Oyle in manner of a Croſſe. Foureteenthly, to caſt in Chryſme. Fifteenthly, to mingle Oyle and Chryſme, and ſo put them into the Water, both together. Sixteenthly, to ſprinkle ſome of this Water ouer all the Font. Where is your *Ambroſe*, your *Chryſoſtome*, your *Cyprian*, or any *Auſtin*, for the defence of theſe ſuperſtitious ceremonies? if a diſcreet man ſhould ſee you, hee might thinke that the Deuill were a coniuring himſelfe, out of his darke infernall habitation, rather than that an Infant were to be receiued into the Congregation. But I hope, when you come to be men in Chriſt, you will put away theſe childiſh things. Concerning the perſon to be baptized, you vſe twelue Ceremonies, as *Bellarmine* confeſſes: which ceremonies, though they were not vſed by Chriſt nor his Apoſtles, yet they *Lib. de Sacr. Bapt. cap. 25.*

were

were vſed by ſome of the Fathers, three or foure hundred yeeres after Chriſt; and with greater conueniency they might be vſed in that infancy of the Church, then in this maturity: firſt, becauſe power to caſt out Deuils, and to doe other miracles, was granted to the Church, which is now ceaſed; and therefore exorciſme and exſufflation, which teſtifies the Deuils expulſion, is in vaine, when there is no ſuch matter. Secondly, becauſe many of thoſe which came then to be baptized, were men of ripe yeeres, and could performe thoſe things in their owne perſons, which Infants cannot; as to giue the Prieſt their names, to be examined in their owne perſons, to renounce the Deuill and his workes, to make a profeſsion of their owne faith, &c. as for ſalt, ſpittle, and oyle, I onely reade the names of them in *Auſtin*, but vſed to any ſuch end about Baptiſme, I cannot finde. Now all that are baptized in our Church (as if in this poynt they were ſworne Papiſts) doe obſerue your laſt ceremonies *ad vnguem*; they abſtaine from fleſh, wine, and women.

Ex can. 30. Con. Nicæni, ex Euſeb. lib. 7. cap. 20.

The ſecond ſort of ceremonies did attend the act of Baptiſme; of which you make fiue. Firſt, to impoſe a name, this is ancient, and is now vſed in all Chriſtian Churches. Secondly, to haue God-fathers; *Suſceptores*, ſaith *Dionyſius*; *Sponſores*, ſaith *Tertullian*; and Saint *Auſtin* calls them, *Reſponſores pro paruulis*, *lib. 1. de peccat. merit. & remiſſ. cap. 34.* And in his three and twentieth Epiſtle hee calls them, *Fidedictores*, (the reading of which Epiſtle I commend to all thoſe that ſhall hereafter take this charge vpon them:) This ceremony is ancient, and practized by the Church of *England*. Thirdly, the third is the conſecration of the water, mentioned by Saint *Auſtin*, *lib. 6. cont. Julianum cap. 8.* by *Ambroſe* and *Cyprian*; and this is alſo approued by the Church of *England*. Fourthly, is thrice dipping in water, which I finde not to bee mentioned in any of Saint *Auſtins* owne workes; though without queſtion it was vſed and abuſed by the Arrians; which cauſed *Gregory* to forbid it in *Spaine*; and afterwards it was condemned in *Concil. 4. Toletano*, held almoſt

Lib. 1. de Sacra. cap. 5.
Lib. 1. Epiſt. vlt.

almoſt a thouſand yeeres agoe. This is neyther enioyned nor practiſed by the Church of *England*: Neither doe your owne men any thing at all eſteeme of this Ceremony. *Si quaritur de immerſione, quoties fieri debeat, preciſe reſpondemus, Vel ſemel, vel ter, pro vario more Eccleſiæ*: If any demand concerning dipping in the water, how often it ought to be done? We anſwere briefly, Either once or thrice, as the Church ſhall thinke fit, ſaith *Lumbard*; ſeconded by *Aquinas* and *Bellarmine*. The laſt is concerning the time. It is granted, that *Eaſter* and *Penteçoſt* were the two ſolemne dayes appointed by the Primitiue Church for baptiſme; but that we ought to continue that cuſtome, it is not the opinion of Saint *Auſtin*, nor of any iudicious Diuine.

Lib. 4. ſent. diſt. 3. *3. par. Sum. q. 66. art. 8.* *Lib. 1. de bapt. cap. 26.*

The third ſort of Ceremonies are ſuch as follow baptiſme; as firſt, that the Prieſt ſhould kiſſe the Infant. Secondly, that he ſhould bee anoynted with Chryſme vpon the top of the head. Thirdly, that he ſhould haue a white garment put on him, which was a cuſtome inuented by the *Arrians*. Fourthly, that a burning Taper ſhould bee put into the Childs hand. None of theſe are mentioned, much leſſe taught by Saint *Auſtin*; and therefore, Maſter *Brereley*, you greatly wrong the Father, to ſay that hee teaches thoſe ſundry Ceremonies now vſed in the Roman Church: but moſt of all your ſelfe, in ſaying ſo, and not being able to proue it. Now the end why you haue inuented all theſe Ceremonies againſt reaſon, and the Catholike Religion, is to keepe your ignorant Laity in a Labyrinthiã maze, to be deuoured of that ſoule-killing monſter, Ignorance; ſo that the multitude of Ceremonies, and their externall gliſtering glory, doth nothing but dazle the eyes of beholders (making them fearfully ſuperſtitious) and ſupply the want of Gods moſt glorious Spirit, which inuiſibly ſhould concurre to ſuch ſacred actions.

Cent. 5. c. 6. pag. 658.

To ſhut vp all therfore in a few concluſions. Firſt, That Saint *Auſtin* teaches not thoſe ſundry Ceremonies now vſed in the Romane Church.

Secondly, That baptiſme is truely and eſſentially a Sacrament,

crament, without theſe Ceremonies: ſo that you may truely adminiſter it with ſome of them, (*modò deſit ſuperſtitio*, if ſuperſtition be wanting) and others without them, according to the diuerſity of places wherein they liue.

Thirdly, that ouer-many Ceremonies doe obſcure and ouer-ſhaddow the truth: and therefore in that Church where there are leaſt Ceremonies, the truth is moſt reſplendent. For my own part, as I haue euer loued peace, & conformity to the true Church in matters of indifferency, by applying Saint *Auſtins* counſell to my ſelfe, ſo I deſire to worke it in others, by freely beſtowing it vpon all. *Quod neque contra fidem, neq; contra bonos mores injunguntur, indifferenter eſt habendum, & pro eorum inter quos vinitur ſocietate ſeruandum eſt, Epiſt.* 118. *Ian. c.* 2. That which is enioyned neither againſt faith nor manners, is to be accounted as indifferent, and to be kept, for the loue and ſociety of them amongſt whom we liue.

Cùm Romam venio, ieiuno Sabbato, cùm hîc ſum, non ieiuno. Sic tu ad quam fortè eccleſiam veneris, eius morem ſerua, ſi cuiquam non vis eſſe ſcandalo, nec quemquam tibi, was the counſell of *Ambroſe* to S. *Auſtin.*

CHAP. VII. §. I.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach the vſe of Confirmation?*

THe practice of the Church of *England*, doth ſufficiently demonſtrate her opinion about this queſtion; that ſhee teaches and allowes the vſe of Confirmation, not with Oyle and Chryſme, but with prayer and impoſition of hands: and Saint *Auſtin* teaches the very ſame, *lib.* 3. *de bapt. cont. Donat. c.* 16. Which act of Confirmation is done onely by way of ſupplication; *eſt ſolennis precandi ritus*: no Sacrament, but a ſolemne Ceremony of the Church, when the Biſhop prayes, that Gods confirming grace may be beſtowed or ſtrengthened on him on whom the hands are laid. So that Saint

Saint *Auſtin* teaches the vſe of Confirmation, but not as it is vſed at this day in the Church of Rome; as it doth euidently appeare, by the definition giuen by both parties: Saint *Auſtin* thus defines it, in the place afore-cited: *Quid eſt enim aliud manus impoſitio, niſi oratio ſuper hominẽ?* What Confirmation, but prayer ouer a man? Which hee confirmes in his fifteenth Booke *de Trinit. c. 26. Orabant vt veniret in eos, quibus manum imponebant, non ipſi eum dabant:* They did pray that the Spirit would come vpon thoſe on whom they layd the hand, they gaue him not. Whereby you may perceiue, that the Apoſtles did vſe to confirme by prayer, and ſo did Saint *Auſtin*, and the other Fathers in his time. But you define it to be *vnctio hominis viatoris in fronte*, an oynting of a man in the fore-head. Whence it followes, that there is a reall difference betweene Saint *Auſtins* Confirmation and yours: for thoſe things that doe differ *definitione*, doe differ *realiter*: and though Saint *Auſtin* makes mention of viſible oyle, yet when he comes to the poynt, he commends onely inuiſible vnction, the internall operation of Gods Spirit: for it is not probable that Saint *Auſtin* would attribute that to Confirmation, which was ordained neither by Chriſt, his Apoſtles, nor the Catholike Church in his time: all of them vſing then onely prayer and impoſition of hands: when as the other kind of Confirmation, vnderpropt *cum termino neceſſitatis ad ſalutem*, and varniſht ouer with the oyle of inuention, was ordayned and confirmed *in Concilio Meldenſi*: So ſaith *Alexander* [illegible]*ales*, and *Bonauenture*, which was held 450. yeeres after Saint *Auſtin*.

Thoſe places which you alledge out of Saint *Auſtin*, doe proue nothing againſt the Church of England: one place ly ſeemes to proue, to which Ile anſwere, and conclude. In his ſecond Booke, *cont. litter. Petil. c.* 104. hee ſayes, That Confirmation is a ſacred Sacrament, euen as Baptiſme. It is true, he cals it ſacred, becauſe ordayned to a holy end: and he cals it a Sacrament, taking the word for a certaine myſtery, as he hath often vſed the word (Sacrament) calling euery myſtery a Sacrament: But you ſay, *Lege 3. Tract. in epiſt. Iob.*

if it be ſacred as baptiſme, then it is a Sacrament properly. To which I anſwer, That *(ſicut)* there in Saint *Auſtin*, ſtands *pro particula ſimilitudinis, non æqualitatis*; implying a ſimilitude, but no equality; for the Spirit may bee ſaid to be giuen in both: in baptiſme, *ad remiſſionem à peccato*: in Confirmation, *ad robur in peccatum*. By the firſt we are regenerated to life; by the ſecond, wee are confirmed to the Combate. So that Saint *Auſtin* holds Confirmation for a ſacred Ceremony ordained by the Church, but not properly for a Sacrament: neither is it that Confirmation which you maintaine with Oyle and Chryſme, but with prayer and impoſition of hands. Which poſition was maintained in a Synode of your owne liking. *Confirmatio ab initio ſola manuum impoſitione exhibita*: Confirmation in the beginning, was giuen onely with impoſition of hands: yet they were not ignorant, that *Euſebius* firſt made it a Sacrament, 310. yeeres after Chriſt: and that *Melchiades* writing to the Biſhops of *Spaine*, held it not to be neceſſary *ad eſſe baptiſmi, ſed ad benè eſſe*; not as diſtinct from baptiſme, but as a complement of baptiſme. Neyther were they ignorant of that Canon decreed *in Con. Meldenſi*, or as ſome others are of opinion, determined long before, *in Con. Laodicenſi*, vnder *Damaſus*, 369. yeeres after Chriſt: yet for all this, they are ingeniouſly bold, to conclude with a *Non fuit ſic à principio*: neyther Chryſme nor Oyle were vſed in the beginning, but onely prayer and impoſition of hands: which Confirmation was taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and is maintained by the Church of England.

Synod. Mogunt. Anno Dom. 850.

Ex epiſt. decret. Euſeb.

Againe, you grant, that your owne Confirmation is not neceſſary to ſaluation: which plainely ſhewes, that Saint *Auſtins* vnction, and your confirmation, are diſtinct actions: for you ſay, that your confirmation is not neceſſary to all ſimply, neither *neceſſitate præcepti*, nor *Sacramenti*; and it is true; but Saint *Auſtins* vnction, which he ſpeaks of, *ad omnes pertinet Chriſtianos*, it doth belong of neceſſity to all Chriſtians, and muſt ſpiritually profit all; as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes, *enarrat. in Pſal. 26. in præfat. enar. 2.* And in another place, ſpeaking of Confirmation, he ſayes, that

Aquin. 3. part. ſum. q. 65. ar. 4.

Pueroruṁ

Puerorum infantium conſecrationes quantùm profuit, obſcuriſſima queſtio eſt, nonnihil tamen prodeſſe, credendum eſt: How farre Confirmation profits children, is a moſt obſcure queſtion, yet we beleeue it profits them ſomething. He holds Confirmation to be a profitable Ceremony, but no neceſſary Sacrament. To conclude all, What-euer Saint *Auſtin* teaches about Confirmation, is receiued by our Church: ſo that yet there is no difference in opinion between Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*. *Lib. de quant. anim. c. vlt.*

CHAP. VIII. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach the reall-corporall preſence of Chriſts body and Blood, in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt?*

THe opinion of the Church of *England* about this queſtion, is contained in the 28. Article of her Religion. That tranſubſtantiation is repugnant to Scripture, ouerthrowes the nature of a Sacrament, and hath giuen occaſion to great ſuperſtition. Now that the very ſame is taught by *Auſtin*, I ſhal (by Gods aſsiſtance) make it plaine, by this enſuing Diſcourſe; when I haue in a word or two refelled that friuolous ſlander, which Mr. *Brereley* caſts vpō our Church in the beginning of his 8. Chapter. The opinions of Proteſtants concerning this controuerſie (ſaith he) are diuers and diſtracted. The fiery nature of a Ieſuite, muſt ſtill burſt out in ſome words of diſſention for an *Exordium*; as if he could not well belye Saint *Auſtin*, except he firſt ſcandalize the Church of *England*. But this is *Romes* proper dialect, and ſhe may enioy it without enuy, not without wonder: For it ſeemes ſtrange to the Papiſtes of *Great Brittaine*, that you (Mr. *Brereley*) ſhould obtrude that for a fault on vs, which is a

capitall crime, ſo highly predominant in your owne Writers. For example, about thoſe words of Chriſt: *Hoc eſt corpus meum.* About the Pronoune (*hoc*) there are as many diuers opinions, as there are diſtinct Writers. (a) and *Bellarmine* confutes the errours of *Durand, Rupertus*, and others, about this queſtion: ſo that Maſter *Brereley* might here haue ſpared his paynes, and neuer accuſed vs in that, wherein his owne Brethren are moſt guilty. To leaue this then as certaine, that Papiſts, about the reall preſence, doe agree in nothing but in diſagreeing, I come to the queſtion, Whether Saint *Auſtin* teach it or no? For anſwere, wee muſt conſider that there is a two-fold reall preſence: the firſt, when it is taken for a certaine, true and effectuall preſence onely; ſo both *Auſtin*, and the Church of *England* doe hold that Chriſt is really preſent after conſecration, two waies: firſt, in reſpect of the ſacramental ſignes, which offer and exhibit that which they ſignifie: ſecondly, in reſpect of the Communicants faith. Secondly, when it is taken for a corporall preſence; that the humane body of Chriſt ſhould be thruſt vp within the ſtrait limits of a Wafer; which reall corporall preſence, though *Bellarmine* promiſes to proue it out of euery Tome in *Auſtin*, yet it is moſt euident, that there is not one word for it in all his workes: for, when Chriſt ſaid, This is my body, hee meant the ſigne of his body, ſaith *Auſtin: Non dubitauit Dominus dicere, (Hoc eſt corpus meum) cùm daret ſignum corporis ſui*; The Lord did not doubt to ſay, This is my body, when hee gaue the ſigne of his body. The other reall-corporall preſence, was tranſubſtantially begot and chriſtened in the Lateran Councell, held vnder *Innocentius* the Third, 1215. and it is certaine, it was not once mentioned in the Church, till aboue ſixe hundred yeeres after Saint *Auſtin*.

To that place which you alledge out of Saint *Auſtin*, that Chriſt was carryed in his owne hands; I anſwere, That Chriſt was carryed in his owne hands *ſignificatiuè, non corporaliter*: and that this is his meaning, he makes it very plaine in his ſecond Sermon vpon that Pſalme, repeating

(a) *Gab. Biel. lect.48. Caiet.in 3.part. Aqu.q.78. Pet. de Aliac. in 4. ſent.q.5. Holcot. in 4. ſent.q.3. Marſ.ibid.q. 6. Scot.ibid.q.2. Rich.de Med. vill. q.1. ibid. Occh. Quodlib. 2.q.19. Bonauent.art.1. q.1. Aquin. par.3. ſum.q.78. Bell.lib. 3. de ſacr.Euch.cont. 2.cap.11. Bell.lib.2.de Euch.cap.24.*

Auſt.cont. Adiman.cap.12.

See the French Moderator.

Enarr.in Pſal. 33.con.1.

peating the very ſame words, hee ſayes: *Ipſe ſe portabat (Quodammodò:)* which word the Schoole-men call *terminus diminuens*, and is vſed by *Theophilact* to the ſame purpoſe. He bore himſelfe in his hands after a ſort, *Sacramentum corporis Chriſti, corpus Chriſti eſt ſecundùm quendam modum*, ſaith *Auſtin*: it is his body after a certaine manner. Which Saint *Auſtin* would neuer haue ſaid, if hee had thought it had beene his (newly-created) naturall body. But it is moſt euident, that Saint *Auſtin* neuer taught any ſuch abſurdity. Yet for the further manifeſtation of Saint *Auſtins* opinion, it is neceſſary for vs to decide theſe queſtions. Firſt, Whether Saint *Auſtin* teach that one body may be in diuers places at once? which muſt needes be true, if euery conſecrated bread bee turned immediately into the naturall body of Chriſt. But Saint *Auſtin* denyes it. *Secundùm corpus in loco eſt, & de loco migrat, et cùm ad alium locum venerit, in eo loco vnde venit non eſt*; His bodie moues from place to place, and cannot be in diuers places at once: and in the precedent tract hee makes it manifeſt that he meant the naturall body of Chriſt: *Corpus Domini* (ſaith he) *in quo reſurrexit, in vno loco eſſe oportet, &c.* The body of our Lord, wherein he roſe from death, muſt be in one place. So in his ſeuen and fiftieth Epiſtle: *Chriſtus vbique eſt per id quod Deus, in cœlo per id quod homo: ſecundùm hanc formam non eſt putandus vbique diffuſus*; Chriſt, as God, is euery where; but, as man, in heauen: according to this forme we muſt not thinke him to be euery-where. Therefore you contradict Saint *Auſtin*, in ſaying, that the naturall body of Chriſt may bee in diuers places at once: which he denyes.

Epiſt. 23. ad Bonif.

Tract. 31. in Ioh.

Secondly, Whether Saint *Auſtin* teach, that a naturall body may be on earth, without a place? which muſt bee true, if the naturall body of Chriſt be included within the little compaſſe of a ſmall piece of bread. But Saint *Auſtin* denyes it, and ſayes, *Locus circundat quodcunque corpus*; and in his third Epiſtle *ad Voluſianum*: *Quantumcunque ſit corpus, ſeu quantulumcunque corpuſculum, loci occupet ſpatium, &c.* Euery body, of what condition ſoeuer, muſt haue

Auſt. de quant. a.

a place. So in his ſeuen and fiftieth Epiſtle *ad Dardanum*, he aſcribes vbiquitie onely to the Deity, but neceſsitie of place, and circumſcription to the humanitie of Chriſt: *Spatia locorum tolle corporibus, nuſquam erunt, & quia nuſquam erunt, non erunt*: if a body haue not a place, it is no where, and becauſe it is no where, it is no body: ſo you ſay, Chriſts body is preſent, but is in no place; therefore it is no body in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement. (And heere I adiure all thoſe Prieſts that haue, or ſhall hereafter reade Saint *Auſtin*, that they ingeniouſly confeſſe, whether this place in *Auſtin* doe not ouerthrow the whole Doctrine of tranſubſtantiation.) So that you muſt eyther teach that Chriſt hath a phantaſticall body, as the Manichees did, or make his humanitie equall with his diuinitie, which was the hereſie of *Eutyches*: or laſtly, that hee tooke no fleſh of the Virgin, but that he brought a certaine Metaphiſicall matter without quantitie or qualities from Heauen, as other Heretiques did; or elſe you can neuer vphold this doctrine, that the phyſicall body of Chriſt may bee on Earth without a place. To this ſame purpoſe ſerues that exhortation of Saint *Auſtin*: *Cauendum eſt ne ita diuinitatem aſtruamus hominis, vt veritatem corporis auferamus*; Wee muſt take heede, leſt wee ſo build vp the Diuinitie of that man (Chriſt) that wee take away the truth of his body. Neither let any one thinke to anſwere theſe places in *Auſtin*, by ſaying as *Bellarmine* does, That God doth it by his ſecret and abſolute power; for it is great fooliſhneſſe in man to diſpute what God can doe by abſolute power; as if (hee being able) were willing alſo to ouerthrow the order of nature; and to ordaine (the old one being ſtifled with multitude of errours) a new Philoſophy. Let vs therefore obey God in his reuealed power; and admire him onely in his abſolute power.

Epiſt. Aug. 57.

Si poſſumus ſalnare Scripturas, per ea quæ naturaliter videmus, non debemus ad miraculum vel ad potentiam diuinam recurrere.

Ægid Rom. li. 2. Hex. 3. cap. 3.

Laſtly, Whether Saint *Auſtin* teach, that accidents may be without a ſubiect? Which muſt neceſſarily follow, if quantitie and qualities of bread remaine, when the ſubſtance of bread is taken away. But Saint *Auſtin* plainely denyes it: *Cui poſſe fieri videatur, vt id quod in ſubiecto eſt, maneat,*

Lib. 2. ſoliloq. cap. 12.

manear, ipſo intereunte ſubiecto? monſtroſum enim & à veritate alieniſſimum eſt, &c. To whom may it ſeeme poſsible to be done, that that which is in a ſubiect may remaine, when the ſubiect is taken away? It is moſt monſtrous. Whoſoeuer hath read S. *Auſtin.*, will bluſh (I know) to heare this called in queſtion; it being ſo manifeſtly contrary to his opinion; who writing vpon thoſe words of *Ariſtotle* (*Quedã ſunt in, quædam dicuntur de*) he approues this definition: *id eſſe in ſubiecto, quod ſine ſubiecto eſſe non poſſit*; that is in a ſubiect, which cannot be without a ſubiect. They are inſeparably vnited: *Si ſubiectum ipſum non maneat, manere non poſſunt*; if the ſubiect doe not remaine, they cannot remaine: according to that common axiome in Philoſophie: *Accidentis eſſe, eſt ineſſe*; hauing an eſſentiall and an intrinſecall dependance vpon the ſubiect: therefore let no ouer-quicke witted Ieſuite ſtudy to maintaine an errour, by ſeparating thoſe things, which GOD hath inſeparably ioyned together.

Lumbard plainely contradicts *Auſtin*, and ſayes, they may ſubſiſt without a ſubiect. *Bellarmine* dares not but agree with Saint *Auſtin*; and ſayes, that accidents cannot be without a ſubiect; and therefore concludes that they are ſuſtayned by ſome ſupernaturall meanes, inuiſible and vnſpeakeable: others haue been of opinion, that they are in the ayre *tanquam in ſubiecto*. Such aiery and phantaſticall poſitions are forged in the braines of thoſe, that are ſworne by immediate ſeruice, to inuent any thing, rather than yeeld to the truth.

Lib. 4. ſenten. diſt. 12.
Lib. 3. de ſacram. Euch. cap. 24.

And here let me giue one Caueat to all young Students of Philoſophy or Diuinity, That they be exceeding wary in reading *Suarez* his Metaphiſicks; where hee makes a long and tedious tract, to proue that accidents may haue being without a ſubiect; whereas hee knew this was impoſsible in nature: but his chiefe ayme is, to prepare the vnderſtanding of his Reader, that hee would beleeue him when he came to write of the Euchariſt. In both places he teaches contrary to Saint *Auſtin* and all antiquity.

Where is now (Maſter *Brereley*) Saint *Auſtins* conformity

mity to the Roman Church? You ſee, he contradicts it *verbatim*, and maintaines the opinion of the Church of *England*, That tranſubſtantiation deſtroyes the naturall bodie of Chriſt, ouerthrowes the nature of a Sacrament, & brings in Idolatry. Ceaſe to reply; reiect nouelty, and beleeue the truth of this queſtion: which for thy more eaſie vnderſtanding (Chriſtian Reader) I will briefly gather into two concluſions. Firſt, Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that euery body muſt haue a place of neceſsitie; that one body cannot be in diuers places at once; that an accident cannot be without a ſubiect; and conſequently, that there can be no reall-corporall preſence of the naturall body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt; *Vt quid paras dentes & ventrem*, as though Chriſt were preſent corporally? *Crede, & manducaſti*; beleeue, and thou haſt eaten. Secondly, the Church of *England* holds nothing now about this queſtion, but what S. *Auſtin* taught long agoe; that the body of Chriſt is really preſent to the beleeuer, but corporally preſent to none on earth: neither can you auoid thoſe many abſurdities which doe neceſſarily follow your opinion, That there ſhould be many Hypoſtaſes in the body of Chriſt; and that the body of Chriſt ſhould be placed by multiplication of conſecrations, in diſtinct *Vbi es?* Both which are impoſsible. Againe, you make this body of Chriſt to be diſcontinuate from that in Heauen, to haue a diſtinct eſſence; that, being taken of the Virgin; this, created by a creature of bread. And laſtly, you make the body of Chriſt ſubiect to the three concoctions, & by conſequent, to corruption. Thus, *vno dato abſurdo* (ſaith *Ariſtotle*) *mille ſequuntur*: many good wits being blinded with Ieſuitiſme, are conſtrained to beleeue that which they cannot defend, neither by authority, reaſon, nor antiquity: for Saint *Auſtin* (you ſee) is againſt you, as well as the Church of *England*.

Aug. tract. 25. in Euang. Ioh. & tract 26. Tertull. de Reſurr. carn. Chryſ. hom. 9. in Matth. & Hom. 60. ad pop. Antioch. Ambroſ. in Lucam. & Auguſt. lib. 3. de doct. Chriſt. cap. 5.

SECT. 2.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the very wicked doe truely receiue the naturall body of Chriſt?*

THe Doctrine of the Church of *England* about this Controuerſie, is ſet downe in the nine and twentieth Article of her religion, That wicked men, and ſuch as be void of a liuely Faith, although they do carnally preſſe with their teeth (as *Auſtin* ſayes) the Sacrament of the body and bloud of Chriſt, yet in no wiſe are they partakers of Chriſt, &c. And the very ſame is taught by Saint *Auſtin*: *Qui diſcordat à Chriſto, nec corpus eius manducat, nec ſanguinem bibis, etiamſi tantæ rei Sacramentum ad iudicium ſuæ præſumptionis, quotidiè indifferenter accipiat*; Hee that diſſents from Chriſt, neither eates his body, nor drinkes his bloud, though hee daily receiue the Sacrament of ſo great a thing, to the condemnation of his owne preſumption. But wicked Reprobates doe all diſſent from Chriſt: therefore they eate not his reall body, but onely the Sacrament of his body; the viſible elements which are common to good and bad; when as life and ſaluation (which neceſſarily followes the participation of the body and bloud of Chriſt) is proper onely to good men, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes: and therefore hee makes a diſtinction betweene the viſible and the inuiſible matter in the Sacrament: betweene *Sacramentum*, and *rem Sacramenti*: the one being common to all; the other, proper to the Elect onely. That this is Saint *Auſtins* opinion, it is very plaine: Firſt, becauſe he teaches, that no man can eate the bodie of Chriſt, except hee remaine in Chriſt, and be a member of him. *Non dicendum eum manducare corpus Chriſti, qui in corpore Chriſti non eſt, &c.* Wee muſt not ſay, nor thinke, that any one can eate the body of Chriſt, which is not in the body of Chriſt. Where hee ſhewes vs, that it is one thing to eate the body of Chriſt, *Sacramento-tenus*, which

Sentent. 339. diſcerpt. ex Aug.

Lib. 7. de baptiſ. cont. Don. c. 33.

Lib. 3. de bapt. cont. Don. c. 10.

Lib. 21. de Ciuit. Dei, cap. 25.

wicked men may doe; and another thing, to eate it really and indeed: for whoſoeuer remaines not in Chriſt, nor Chriſt in him, let him neuer ſay or thinke (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) that hee doth eate the fleſh, or drinke the bloud of Chriſt. Now, no wicked Reprobate remaines in Chriſt, and therefore (in *Auſtins* iudgement) he cannot truly eate the body of Chriſt: *Qui non in me manet, & in quo ego non maneo, non dicat aut exiſtimet, ſe mãducare corpus Chriſti, &c.*

Tom. 9. tract. 26. in Iob. poſt medium. Secondly, becauſe he teaches that none can receiue *rem Sacramenti* (i.) the reall body of Chriſt to his deſtruction: *Res verò ipſa cuius Sacramentum eſt, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicunq; eius particeps fuerit:* and he giues the reaſon, Becauſe it makes the receiuers immortall, and incorruptible, by an indiuiſible ſocietie with the Deitie. But all wicked reprobates who communicate, doe receiue the Sacrament to their owne deſtruction; and therefore, in Saint *Auſtins* opinion, none of them can receiue the reall body of Chriſt. And this (Maſter *Brereley*) is ſo manifeſt, that I am perſwaded when you reade it, you will retract your opinion.

To your obiections I anſwere. Firſt, by granting that the wicked doe eate vnworthily; *non malum accipiendo*, not by receiuing an ill thing, becauſe they receiue the good creatures of God conſecrated to a holy end; *ſed malè vtendo*, but by vſing it ill, as wanting faith, Gods inorganicall inſtrument, whereby the ſoule ſhould become operatiue euen to the reall eating of the body & bloud of Chriſt: and therefore thoſe that want faith, can neuer eate the bo-

Lib. cont. Fil. Donat. ſ. dy and bloud of Chriſt. *Bono benè non vſi ſunt*, ſaith *Auſtin*. Secondly, by denying that by *corpus & ſanguis Domini*, Saint *Auſtin* did meane the naturall body of Chriſt, taken of the Virgin, vnited to the Deity, and now ſeated in Heauen: for hee did not, but onely thoſe externall elements which doe repreſent the naturall body and bloud

Tract. 26. in Ioh. of Chriſt: *tanta rei Sacramentum ad indicium manducant & bibunt*; they eate and drinke the Sacrament of the body and bloud of Chriſt, but not the body and bloud of Chriſt, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes. To that other place which you alledge.

alledge *ex lib. cont. Fulg. Don. cap. 6.* (it being not deuided into Chapters, your Author cauſed you to erre in alledging the Chapter.) I anſwere, that *Iudas* did receiue the good body of Chriſt (*quodammodò*) after a ſort; for euen as Saint *Auſtin* ſayes that Chriſt was carried in his owne hands *quodammodò*, (as is noted before) ſo *Iudas* did receiue his body after a ſort. Though it bee controuerted whether he did receiue or no, yet becauſe Saint *Auſtin* affirmes it, without contrarying the written Word, I will not deny it; but grant (as *Auſtin* doth) that hee receiued the conſecrated Bread and Wine, but not the reall body of Chriſt; and therefore *Auſtin* ſayes, that *Iudas* did eate onely *panem Domini*, but all the reſt did eate *panem Dominum*: hee did eate onely Chriſts bread, but the reſt did eat the Bread-Chriſt. Thus, you ſee, Saint *Auſtin* doth not yet differ in Religion from the Church of *England*; whoſe agreeing doctrine about this queſtion, may be contayned in one negatiue concluſion:

Enarr. in Pſ. 33. con. 1.

That no wicked Reprobate can eate and drinke the naturall fleſh and bloud of Chriſt; this is the prime and ancient truth taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and maintayned by the Church of *England*; what-euer hath beene inuented ſince, is new, and therefore hereticall; neyther can any Ieſuite in the world proue the contrary: For then it would follow, firſt, that Chriſt ſhould dwell in Reprobates, and they in Chriſt; *Hoc eſt manducare, in Chriſto manere*, This is to eate, to remaine in Chriſt; ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. Secondly, that part of the naturall bodie of CHRIST ſhould bee tormented in Hell; beeing eaten of a Reprobate, digeſted by him, and vnited to him; *Damnato vnita, cruciabitur in inferno; ſaluato homini vnita, glorificabitur in cœlo*; That part which is vnited to a man damned, ſhall be tormented in Hell; and that part vnited to a man ſaued, ſhall be glorified in Heauen, as *Bellarmine* ſpeaks. Which to affirme or thinke, were more than arch-blaſphemie. Eſteeme not then ſo baſely of ſo precious food, but ſuffer thy ſoule to flye abouc the ſpheares of heauen; there hugge thy ſelfe in the ſweet contemplatiue em-

Diſtinct. 44.

braces of thy Sauiour, and by faith onely bee made one with him; and let no Prieſt hereafter, Secular nor Ieſuite, ſo ſchiſmatically exceede all fore-paſt hereſie; as to draw downe the naturall body of Chriſt from heauen, and to prepare it for diuels and damned men to feede on; and ſo trample vnder their feete that precious bloud, that muſt waſh our ſinne-ſtayned ſoules from all impurity. Saint *Auſtin* durſt not doe it, nor the Church of *England*.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that this Sacrament of the Euchariſt ought to be receiued faſting?*

WHether it ought to bee receiued faſting, or no, is no fundamentall point of faith, and therefore it is not determined in any Article of our Religion: but that it is the moſt conuenient way to receiue it faſting, hath beene the knowne tenent of the moſt iudicious of our Engliſh Diuines: for true faſting is the beſt foode of the ſoule, imprinting in that modell of Eternity, the rich characters of all perfection; without which, no man can exactly performe any duety. *Quot quot viros virtutum vidimus, ſine ieiunio non legimus aſcendiſſe*: How many vertuous men ſoeuer we haue ſeene, yet wee reade of none that aſcended without faſting, ſaith *Cyprian*. And this cauſed Saint *Auſtin*, not vndeſeruedly, to commend it to all poſterity; eſpecially in his Tract *de vtilitate ieiunij*, (if that Booke bee his.) Neither would I wiſh any one, more ſcrupulous then iudicious, by denying this laudable cuſtome, to contradict antiquity; eſpecially, ſeeing it is a precedent preparatiue for the reuerent receiuing of the body and bloud of Chriſt: *Nam ideò mos iſte per vniuerſum orbem ſeruatur*; For therefore that cuſtome is kept ouer the whole world, ſaith *Auſtin*. Now the reaſon why wee ought to admit of it, is giuen by Saint *Auſtin*, in the ſecond Chapter of that Epiſtle: Becauſe whatſoeuer is againſt

Lib. de. ieiun. & tentat. Chriſti.

Epiſt. 118. ad. Ianuari.

gainſt neither faith nor manners, ought to be held as indifferent, and to be kept, for the ſociety and vnity of that Church wherein we liue. But faſting before the receiuing of the Sacrament, (not out of a ſuperſtitious, but a pious reſolution for a fitter preparation) is neither againſt faith nor manners, and therefore it is conuenient to bee obſerued; not of abſolute neceſsity, (as if a man could not be ſaued that receiued not faſting; for then had all the Apoſtles bin damned: *nam eos accepiſſe non ieiunos apparet*; for they receiued it not faſting, ſaith S. *Auſtin*) but of commendable conueniency, becauſe it is *ſtatutum Eccleſiæ rationabile*, as *Aquinas* cals it. For further direction to any, that deſires rightly to vnderſtand Saint *Auſtin*, he muſt knowe that there is a foure-fold faſt. The firſt is *ieiunium naturale*, which is an abſolute abſtinence from all kinds of meat and drinke, a whole naturall day, or ſo long as by nature a man is able to hold out. The ſecond is *ieiunium morale*, which is nothing but a habit of temperance; and ſo euery man is ſaid to faſt, that takes his meate and drinke in due time, temperately and ſoberly. The third is *eccleſiaſticum*, which is, to abſtaine from all meate and drinke at ſome ſolemne times, for good cauſe appointed by the Church; and then not to abſtaine onely from groſſe meats, (which many ignorant ſoules thinke to be good faſting) and glut our ſelues with pampering delicates, but to abſtaine from all things ſimply; for this was the cuſtome of the primitiue Church. The laſt is *ieiunium ſpirituale*, which is, to abſtaine from ſin, and vnlawfull pleaſures; and this by Saint *Auſtin* is called *ieiunium perfectum*, a perfect faſt. All theſe kindes of faſting are neceſſary to a Chriſtian: the morall and ſpirituall alwayes, *neceſſitate abſolutâ*: the naturall and Eccleſiaſticall ſometimes only, *neceſſitate reſpectiuâ*; and one time is (in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement) before the receiuing of the Sacrament, (ſicke perſons, and weake natures onely excepted) and that for two reaſons. Firſt, *propter honorem & reuerentiam Sacramenti*; for honour and reuerence of the Sacrament, as Saint *Auſtin* there ſpeakes. Secondly, *propter myſterium & ſignificationem*, that Chriſt ſhould firſt

of

of all be receiued into our hearts: which reaſon is giuen both by Saint *Auſtin*, and *Aquinas*. And this I take to be *Auſtins* opinion in this point, profeſt at this day, and practiſed in the Church of *England*.

Part. 3. ſum. q. 80. art 8.

Concerning the care which Chriſtians ought to haue in receiuing the body of Chriſt, Saint *Auſtin* makes a compariſon betweene hearing and receiuing. As we ought to giue moſt reuerent attention to the preaching of the Word, (which is the chiefe thing that Saint *Auſtin* aimes at in that 26. Homilie) ſo we ought with great care and reſpect, to receiue the body of Chriſt at the Miniſters hand, leſt through contempt or negligence, we be found vnworthy receiuers. *Quanta ſolicitudine obſeruamus, quando nobis corpus Chriſti miniſtratur?* With what great care doe we wayte, when the body of Chriſt is miniſtred vnto vs, &c? Not for that they thought it was ſome new-created deity, capable of adoration, but only to demonſtrate their zealous piety towards the repreſentation.

Laſtly, concerning holy bread: our ordinary bread, ſanctified by the Word of God and Prayer, is Saint *Auſtins* holy bread; which in his time was giuen to new Conuerts: and the reaſon why he cals it *ſanctior quàm cibi quibus alimur*, is, becauſe it had benediction and diſtribution in a more ſolemne aſſembly. And more then this, you cannot proue from any place in *Auſtin*. Againe, the holy bread mentioned by Saint *Auſtin*, was giuen onely to ſuch as were *Catechumeni*, who might not cõmunicate; but your holy bread is giuen to euery one indifferently. Now to reaſon thus: Saint *Auſtin* makes mention of ſanctified bread: *ergo*, he teaches, the papiſticall vſe of holy bread, is childiſh Sophiſtry: Not vnlike to that other merry argument, made by ſome Cardinall, (for it is very Lord-like) when Logick and Philoſophie were baniſht the Court of *Rome*: *Domini ſunt Cardines terræ*, (ſo it is ſaid in the Pſalme;) *ergo*, Cardinals ought to be Lords of the earth. But I haue found you (Mr. *Brereley*) more learnedly ingenuous, and therefore I know, you are aſhamed of all ſuch pelting ſhifts. Know then further, that ſuch groſſe errours comming to bee waighed

waighed in the ballance of truth, cannot be maintained by men, Ieſuites, nor diuels: *Nam magna eſt veritas, & prævalebit.* And that it may quickly preuaile, *te invoco, Deus veritas, in quo, & à quo, & per quem vera ſunt, quæ vera ſunt omnia, vindica veritatem ab errore, & à fallaciarum ludibrio, ut hoc finito ſeculo, cum ipſa veritate, veritatis profeſſores glorificentur, per Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum.*

SECT. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt ought to be adored?*

THE Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not by Chriſts ordinance reſerued, carried about, lifted vp, nor worſhipped, ſaith the Church of *England.* *Artic.* 28. And Saint *Auſtin* teaches the very ſame, That hee dares worſhip no creature whatſoeuer. *Timeo adorare terram, ne damnet me qui fecit cœlum & terram*: I am afraid to worſhip earth, leſt He condemne me that made both heauen and earth, ſaith *Auſtin.* *Enarr. in Pſa.* 98. And that no creature ought to be adored, neither with λατρεια nor δουλια, Saint *Auſtin* is very plaine: ſaying, *Diuinè ac ſingulariter ab Eccleſia catholica traditur, nullam creaturam colendam eſſe animæ, ſed ipſum tantummodò rerum omnium Creatorem*: It is diuinely and ſingularly ordained by the Catholike Church, that the ſoule of man ſhould worſhip no creature, but onely the Creator of all things. The Creator of all things is to be worſhipped with λατρεια. And a little after, *Illi ſoli ſeruies*, (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) δουλια belongs to him onely: for if the ſoule ſhould adore bread, earth, image, or any other creature; it would then follow, that they were better then the ſoule; but it is manifeſt, that no created Entity is better then the ſoule; therefore it ought to adore nothing but the Creator. This is Saint *Auſtins* Argument. Now that the viſible bread in the Sacramẽt of the Euchariſt, is a *Lib. de quant. anim. c.* 34.

creature, I hope there is none ſo ſottiſhly ignorant, as to deny: and therefore, in *Auſtins* iudgement, it ought not to be adored.

To that which you obiect out of *Auſtin*, that *nemo carnem manducauit, niſi prius adorauerit*; I anſwere; That in this Sacrament there are two things to be conſidered: the one ſeene, toucht, taſted, and contained in the viſible celebration, as bread and wine, which may be reuerenced and honoured, but not adored. *Species viſibiles Sacramenti altaris (quia creatura) non ſunt adorandæ:* The viſible bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Altar, are not to be adored, becauſe they are creatures, ſaith *Scotus*. Againe, *Nullum ſenſibile eſt adorandum:* No ſenſible thing is to bee adored; therefore neither Bread nor Wine. The other not ſeene, but ſignified onely, and applyed to the ſoule by the inuiſible act of faith: and this is the reall-naturall body of Chriſt; which being conſidered not ſimply as it is a creature, but as it is vnited to the Deity, *per vnionem hypoſtaticam*, is to be adored. And ſo S. *Auſtin* is to be vnderſtood in thoſe words which you alledge. No man hath ſpiritually eaten Chriſt, but he that hath firſt inſpirit adored him: no man can truely eate the body of Chriſt, but that hath firſt adored *totum Chriſtum, & totum Chriſti*; the whole perſon of Chriſt; his Deity ſimply, his humanity, as vnited to the Deity. The hypoſtatical vnion is of ſuch great force, as that we cannot adore the Deity of Chriſt, but we muſt needs worſhip that humanity ſo vnited to the Deity: but there is no ſuch vnion betweene the bread and the Deity, (as it hath beene already proued out of Saint *Auſtin*;) and therefore there can be no adoration of the viſible bread, without Idolatrie.

Lib. 4. diſt. 11. q. 3.

The Church of Chriſt in Saint *Auſtins* time, did reuerence and honour the ſignes, as holy things; but they did adore Chriſt only, ſignified by thoſe ſignes. *Fluctuans cõuerto me* (ſaith *Auſtin*) *ad Chriſtum*; whom not to adore, muſt needs be ſtrange impiety. Now that the Church of *England* agrees with Saint *Auſtin* in this Doctrine, it is euident by that ancient and comely ceremony of kneeling, inclination

or proſternation of their bodies (as *Auſtin* ſpeakes) in the act of receiuing, not to the ſignes, but to Chriſt ſignified: for ſo S. *Auſtin* admoniſhed thoſe that receiued the Sacrament kneeling in his time, (*Cùm te inclinas atq; proſternis ad terram quamlibet, non quaſi terram intuearis, ſed illum ſanctum, &c.* When thou kneeleſt, looke not vpon, adore not the bare element, but the holy one, &c. So in other places he ſpeakes of adoration, not of the externall viſible ſignes, but of Chriſt ſignified. And this is all that Saint *Auſtin* teaches, (being as much as moſt of your learned Diuines require) which is alſo allowed and practiſed by the Church of *England*.

Kneeling in the act of receiuing, was vſed long before Tranſubſtantiation was brought into the Church.

It is true that *Auerroes* makes mention of adoration, which was vſed, but not determined of in his time: for it is certaine, it was neuer fully defined, till the raigne of *Honorius*; elſe had that *magnus ſententiarum magiſter* made mention of it, in his diſtinctions *de Sacramento Altaris*; where he doth not once name tranſubſtantiatiõ, adoratiõ, nor inuocation. Now whereas you labour to cleere *Honorius* from being the Author of that Idolatrie, you ſhall perceiue your ſelfe to bee in an errour: for in *Lumbards* time, who liued 760. yeeres after *Auſtin*, there was little or no mention made of it in the Church: but within 60. yeeres after, it was confirmed and publiſht. The Author then muſt of neceſsity be, either (*Calixtus* 3. *Lucius* 3. *Vrbanus* 3. *Greg.* 8. *Clementus* 3. *Cœleſtinus* 3. *Innocentius* 3. or *Honorius*. If you will needs free him, make your choice of ſome of the reſt; and then conclude, that it is but a humane conſtitution, inuented long ſince the death of Saint *Auſtin*. Laſtly, that Angels are preſent at the celebration of the Euchariſt, (as *Chryſoſtome* ſpeakes) there's no man can deny it; either as aſsiding, protecting, or aſsiſting the parties and the action.

Laſtly, whereas you doe ſo reprochfully maligne that reuerend and learned Biſhop of our Land, to haue dealt deceitfully, and anſwered nothing. (I haue not heard of late, of any that was deceitfull in anſwering, and yet anſwered nothing at all.) Had I not read it in your owne Booke,

Omnibus inuidias, Liuide, nemo tibi.

I could neuer haue thoght, that you would haue caſt ſo baſe
Dr. Mourton. a cenſure vpon ſo learned and iudicious a Scholler, as you haue felt him to be. I am vnworthy to make any Apologie for him; his owne workes and words are better able to free him from the blacke iawes of enuy and detraction. To conclude all in a word; Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that the perſon of Chriſt, conſiſting of Diuine and humane nature, ought to be adored, but no outward viſible element in the Sacrament, as bread and wine, nor any other created Entity. Which we alſo maintaine. So that yet there is no difference betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Sect. 5.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Euchariſt is a true and proper Sacrifice?*

THe Doctrine of the Church of *England* about this queſtion, is contained in the 31. Article of her Religion: That the offering of Chriſt once made, is a perfect ſatisfaction for the ſinnes of the world; and that there is none other but that alone. Wherefore the Sacrifice of the Maſſe is a blaſphemous fable, and a dangerous deceit. Which opinion is maintained by Saint *Auſtin* in diuers places; as I ſhall make it manifeſt to the Reader, by Gods aſsiſtance. But leſt any crafty Ieſuite ſhould hereafter delude the ſimple and ignorant Laity, to beleeue the contrary by the authority of Saint *Auſtin*, it is neceſſary that we acquaint them with thoſe ſeuerall ſorts of ſacrifice, mentioned by Saint *Auſtin*, all which were and are true Sacrifices in their time and kind.

Lib. 7. queſt. ſuper Iud. q. 49. Firſt, he mentions a bloudy Sacrifice, typicall onely and ceremonicall, and diuides it into foure kinds, not neceſſary heere to be named: all which, being vnable to endure the glorious comming of the Sonne of God, were driuen away with the calme voice of the Goſpell, as Saint *Auſtin* *Epiſt. 120. ad Honorat. c. 18.* teſtifies. So that ſince the comming of the Goſpell, there

is no liuing corporall ſacrifice; no ſacrificing of fleſh and bloud, which hath vnion and being, eyther by naturall generation, or miraculous creation; becauſe Chriſts *conſummatum eſt*, gaue them their expected impletion, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes in his nineteenth Booke *cont. Fauſt. Manich. cap.* 10. and therefore, in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, Chriſtians doe not now offer vp the naturall body and bloud of Chriſt.

Secondly, hee makes mention of one bloudy ſacrifice once truely and really offered for the ſinnes of mankinde; which he calls *ſacrificium ſanguinis pro nobis oblatum*: and this reall offering of Chriſts naturall body and bloud was but once, ſaith *Auſtin: Nónne ſemel immolatus eſt Chriſtus in ſeipſo?* Was not Chriſt once offered vp in himſelfe? *Epiſt.* 23. *Tom.* 8. *enarr. in Pſalm.* 50. & *enarr. in Pſal.* 129.

Chriſt was but once offered in himſelfe. And in his *Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap.* 33. he calls it, *Sacrificium ſingulare*, as not capable of iteration: and therefore in Saint *Auſtins* opinion, there is no more ſacrificing of Chriſt *in ſeipſo* (i.) of his reall-naturall body; but onely figuratiuely, and by way of commemoration in the Sacrament: which plainly ouerthrowes Maſter *Brereleyes* tenent, and agrees *verbatim* with the opinion of the Church of *England*.

Thirdly, he makes mention of a ſpirituall ſacrifice, *lib.* 10. *de Ciuit. Dei, cap.* 4. & 6. where he ſayes, that euery man dying to the World, that he may liue to God, is a ſacrifice; which hee calls, *ſacrificium fidei*, the ſacrifice of Faith: *enarr. in Pſalm.* 55. *Sacrificium Deo eſt ſpiritus contribulatus, in Pſalm.* 130. A troubled ſpirit is a ſacrifice to God.

Laſtly, hee makes mention of a ſacrifice of praiſe and thankſgiuing, *lib.* 20. *contr. Fauſt. Manich. cap.* 21. and for inſtance hee brings the Euchariſt; which (ſaith *Auſtin*) before the comming of Chriſt was promiſed *per victimas ſimilitudinum*, by ſacrifices of reſemblance. In the paſsion of Chriſt, it was offered in deed and truth; but after his aſcenſion, it is celebrated onely *per ſacramentum*.

mentum memoriæ, by a Sacrament of remembrance; then which (if it be wel obſerued) nothing can be ſpoken more plaine to confirme the Doctrine of the Church of *England*: That Chriſt was once ſacrificed in the truth of his body, but often by a Sacrament of remembrance. And in this ſence it is, that Saint *Auſtin* calls the *Euchariſt* a commemoratiue ſacrifice of prayſe and thankſgiuing, in memory of that one true and proper ſacrifice, offered by Chriſt himſelfe. And ſo are thoſe places to be vnderſtood which you alledge out of *Auſtin*. Concerning the offering of *Melchiſedech*, Saint *Auſtin* grants, it was a ſacrifice of prayſe and thankeſgiuing: Some difference there is; ours is reall and commemoratiue of a thing paſt; that was typicall and figuratiue of ſomething to come: typically demonſtrating before the deſcenſion of Chriſt, what Chriſtians ſhould actually performe after his aſcenſion.

For the more manifeſtation of the truth, and of Saint *Auſtins* meaning, I will propoſe to the Readers conſideration theſe concluſions againſt Maſter *Brereley*. Firſt, that Saint *Auſtin* makes no mention of any ſacrificing of the naturall body of Chriſt, without effuſion of bloud; which will appeare plainly to any that peruſes his works; and therefore your *miſſale ſacrificium exſangue*, ſacrificing the naturall body of Chriſt without effuſion of bloud, cannot be proued out of Saint *Auſtin*; vnleſſe you vnderſtand this ſacrifice of prayſe, wherein there is no offering of the naturall body of Chriſt, but a receiuing of the ſignes of his body; which is a commemoratiue ſacrifice onely (as Saint *Auſtin* calls it,) and therefore no proper ſacrifice.

Secondly, That the Euchariſt is no proper ſacrifice, I meane, the naturall body of Chriſt is not there ſlaine, and ſacrificed to God; but it is onely a ſigne or memory of that body once truely ſacrificed: *Eſt ſacramentum memoriæ*; it is a Sacrament of remembrance, ſaith *Auſtin*. And he knowing that men in his time did call it a ſacrifice, leſt they ſhould fall into ſome further hereſie (as you haue done) he layes downe this very concluſion as a Ca-

uea.

ueat to them: *Illud quod ab hominibus appellatur ſacrificium, ſignum eſt veri ſacrificij*; that which men call a ſacrifice, is but the ſigne of a true ſacrifice. Read this, and then bluſh, (Maſter *Brereley:*) for what you call a proper ſacrifice, Saint *Auſtin* calls but the ſigne of a true and proper ſacrifice. To this your Maſter of the ſentences conſents: That which is conſecrated by the Prieſt, *vocatur ſacrificium, quia memoria eſt & repraſentatio veri ſacrificij*; it is called a ſacrifice, becauſe it is the memory and repreſentation of a true ſacrifice. And a little after, *In ſacramento recordatio fit illius, quod factum eſt ſemel*; in the Sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was done once. So *Aquinas: Dicitur Chriſtus immolari repraſentatiuè*; Chriſt is ſaid to be ſlaine in the Sacrament (not properly) but by way of repreſentation.

Lib. 10. de Ciuit. Dei, cap. 5.

Lib. 4. Sentent. diſt. 12.

3. parte Sum. q. 83. art. 1.

Laſtly, Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that the Eucharift is *ſacrificium Euchariſticũ*; a commemoratiue ſacrifice of prayſe and thankeſgiuing, *Epiſt. 95. lib. 17. de Ciuit. Dei, cap. 20.* and in diuers other places which I ſpare to name, becauſe your quotations doe proue this aſſertion. By this you may ſee, that Saint *Auſtin*, *Lumb.* *Aquin.* and the Church of *England*, doe teach with one accord, That the Eucharift is no proper ſacrifice, but onely the ſigne, the memory, the image and repreſentation of a true ſacrifice.

Bell. lib. 6. de Sacram. Eucha. cap. 2.

Sect. 6.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is propiciatory for the dead?*

IT is denyed by the generall conſent of our *Engliſh* Diuines: and as for Saint *Auſtins* opinion in this queſtion, it depends vpon the former controuerſie; where hee teaches that it is not properly a ſacrifice, and therefore in his opinion it cannot be propiciatory: how farre Saint *Auſtin* held, that the commemoratiue prayers of the liuing, might profit the ſoules of their departed friends,

friends, I will briefly in a word or two declare to the Reader.

Sacrifices are to be conſidered in a two-fold act: firſt, *actu reduplicatiuo*; and ſo no humane ſacrifices, *quatenùs ſacrificia*, as they are ſacrifices, are propiciatory. Secondly, *actu ſpecificato*, as they are ordayned by GOD to ſuch and ſuch an end: and ſo ſome are typicall, propiciatory onely *adumbratiuè*: one is reall, and truely propicious for the ſinnes of all the World; which cannot bee offered againe, but is ſtill propiciatory for all that beleeue. There is alſo a two-fold act propiciatory: the firſt, which did free the body from temporall puniſhment vnder the law: the ſecond, which did and doth free the ſoule; and that (in Saint *Auſtins* opinion) two wayes. Firſt, from ſinne and paine poſitiue, by the death of Chriſt onely. The ſecond doth free the ſoule, not from ſinne nor paine poſitiue, but from ſome priuatiue puniſhment. And ſo Saint *Auſtin* thought that the ſoules of faithfull men departed, being *in abditis receptaculis*, as he ſpeakes, and not enioying a perfect viſion, might be helpt by the commemoratiue ſacrifices of their liuing friends; who praying to God vnfeignedly, might procure them ſometimes a more compleat viſion, than they ordinarily doe enioy; for the ſoules of the Saints departed, enioy not the ſame glory with the Angels, nor ſhall, till the Reſurrection, in *Auſtins* opinion.

Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 109.

As for thoſe two places which you vrge concerning Saint *Auſtins* Mother; I anſwere, That hee was perſwaded (neither modeſty nor charitie can tolerate a denyall) that his Mother was *valdè bona*; and therefore that ſacrifice which was offered for her, was nothing but *gratiarum actio*; a commemoration or giuing of thankes to God for her departure in the Faith; for ſo ſaith *Auſtin*, that *ſacrificia pro valdè bonis, gratiarum actiones ſunt*. Which action of his being onely Euchariſticall, could not be propiciatory: ſo Saint *Auſtin* ſayes, that *in communicatione corporis Domini, ſit mortuorum memoria*. And this kinde of ſacrificing is approued by the Church of *England*, where

Lib. 20. de ciuit. Dei, cap. 9. & lib. de cura pro mort. gerend. cap. 1. in fine.

ſacri-

ſacrificare and *cum laude defunctorum nomina recitare*, are termes equiualent, as they were with *Cyprian, Lib.* 4. *Epiſt.* 5.

Againe, Saint *Auſtin* thought that our commemoratiue prayers might profit the dead Saints, in praying that God would forgiue them their ſinnes; not in *actu de præſenti*, but onely *de præterito* (.i.) that God would be pleaſed to continue that which hee had done already; not as though wee thought that God would reuoke what hee had done, but only to ſhew our loue to them, and obedience to him, heartily aſſenting to that which he had freely performed: and ſo Saint *Auſtin* prayed for his Mother *Monicha*; *Pro peccatis matris meæ deprecor te, &c. dimitte Domine, dimitte obſecro, &c.* I beſeech thee for the ſinnes of my Mother, forgiue Lord, forgiue. Not becauſe Saint *Auſtin* thought, his Mothers ſinnes were not forgiuen: for hee addes preſently; *Credo iam feceris quod rogo, &c.* I beleeue that thou haſt done that already; but becauſe he would haue the Lord to continue that action, and bury her ſinnes in euerlaſting obliuion: neuer to puniſh them in any of her poſterity. This is allowed and practized in the Liturgy of the Church of *England*: in praying that the Lord would not remember their ſinnes, to puniſh them in vs. Moreouer, wee hope all good to the dead, and in all our prayers doe wiſh all good to them, that they are capable of; ſo that yet there is no difference in Religion betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Lib. 9. *confeſſ. cap.* 13.

Sect. 7.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that this Sacrament was offered vpon Altars?*

IT is granted, that in *Auſtins* time they did offer it vpon Altars; yet Altars then were not generally vſed, ſaith *Arnobius*: nor neceſſary to the ſeruice of God, ſaith

Lib. 6. *aduerſ. Gentes. Comment. in Pſal.* 133. *& Chryſ. hom.* 46. *in Matth.*

ſaith *Hierome*. And yet the Church of Chriſt may lawfully vſe Altars, ſetting aſide Romiſh ſuperſtition and heatheniſh Gentiliſme; for Altars were chiefly vſed by the Gentiles, as diuers Hiſtorians teſtifie: Whereupon, they adored imaginary Idols, and offered ſacrifice to a corruptible deitie: as for waſhing of the Altar, anoynting it, and ſigning it with the externall viſible ſigne of the Croſſe: it was the vſe onely of Heathens, as *Arnobius* witneſſeth, *lib. 7. contr. Gentes.* which were afterward brought into the Roman Church by *Euariſtus*, who ſate in the Chayre of *Rome* one hundred and tenne yeeres after Chriſt, about the third perſecution in the Reigne of *Traiane*, and ſome fortie yeeres after confirmed by *Hyginus*. Of theſe things Saint *Auſtin* makes no mention; as for that nineteene Sermon *De Sanctis*, when you can proue it to be Saint *Auſtins* worke, Ile anſwere to it. To conclude, there hath beene vſed in the Church a two-fold Altar: the firſt was, *Altare fixum*, firmely ſet and made of ſtone, ſuch as the Patriarkes vſed, when they offered their ſacrifices; and to theſe Altars the Croſſe gaue a conſummation and end: the ſecond is, *Altare viaticum*, an Altar which might be carryed from place to place; which is and ought to be retayned in the Church: and ſo our Communion-Table is the viſible and moueable Altar, whereon wee offer vp the ſacrifice of prayer and thankſgiuing, in memory of that one Sacrifice before mentioned: and this Altar is hallowed when the whole Church or Chappell hath its conſecration. And thus farre holds the agreement betwixt Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Sozo. lib. 5. cap. 16. Theod. lib. 3. cap. 16.

Symach. in Ep. pro ſacrũ pal.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach the neceſsitie of auricular Confeſsion to Prieſts?*

CONfeſsion is the Key that opens the doore leading to the Mercy-ſeate; *obſtruit os inferni, portas aperit Paradiſi*; it ſhuts the doore of Hell, and opens the gates of Paradiſe, ſaith *Auſtin*: it is *ſalus animæ, & vita peccatoris*, it is the health of the ſoule, and life of a ſinner, ſaith *Bernard*. It is the actiue parent of Repentance, ſaith *Tertullian*: Euery man is borne to confeſsion, by reaſon of innate pollution. *Epiſt. 121. cap. 14. Epiſt. Lib. de pœnitent. cap. 9.*

Seeing that Confeſsion was ſo highly eſteemed by the Fathers of the Primitiue Church, it behoues vs to conſider what kinde of confeſsion they meant. Take Saint *Auſtins* diuiſion, and then confeſsion is two-fold: Firſt, *laudis*, to confeſſe the Deity, and all the diuine attributes: Secondly, *fraudis*, when the ſinner doth accuſe himſelfe before God. You cleaue ſo firmely to the bare letter of of this laſt, that you haue quite robb'd your ſelues of the true meaning of it; for confeſsion, as it is now abuſed in the Romane Church, is nothing elſe but *confeſſio fraudis*, robbing poore men of their money, and coozening kinde women of their honeſty; and for this cauſe, *Nectarius*, Biſhop of Conſtantinople, aboliſhed it; which act of his was approued by *Chryſoſtome*, his ſucceſſour. But vnderſtand the word truely and ſimply as Saint *Auſtin* did, and then it is a pleading-guilty, to obtaine mercy: and it is two-fold: firſt, of the heart, when wee confeſſe our ſinnes to God alone, eyther formally, or virtually; and this was chiefly practized and commended by Saint *Auſtin*; *Volo eam facere in corde meo coram Te in confeſſione*; I will make *Hom. 8. in verb. Euang.* *Lib. 10. confeſſ. cap. 1.*

it in my heart before thee in confeſsion. And in the third Chapter following, What haue I to doe with men, *vt audiant confeſſiones meas*, that they ſhould heare my confeſsions, ſaith hee? He thought it ſufficient to confeſſe to God alone. The ſecond is of the mouth, when wee actually confeſſe to men, what we had before confeſt to God; and this eyther priuate or publique: priuate is two-fold; firſt, to our offended neighbour or friend; *qui multos offendit peccando, placare multos oportet ſatisfaciendo:* Whoſoeuer hath offended many by ſinning, muſt appeaſe many by ſatisfying, ſaith the Author of that Booke *de vera & falſa pœnitent.* And this is for ſatisfaction. Secondly, to the Presbyter, or ſome other faithfull man: *Humiliter non ſolùm Deo, ſed etiam Sanctis & Deum timentibus confiteri*; To confeſſe humbly not onely to God, but to good men, and ſuch as feare God, ſaith *Auſtin:* and this is for conſolation. This is Saint *Auſtins* auricular confeſsion; which, in his opinion, may be made to holy men, and to thoſe that feare God, as well as the Presbyter; and therefore (if Saint *Auſtin* muſt be Iudge) there is no neceſsitie of auricular Confeſsion to Prieſts onely.

Enarr. in Pſalm. 66.

Hom. 12.

Publique confeſsion is alſo two-fold: eyther of the whole Church in ſolemne and publique faſts: or of ſome particular member of the Church, in way of publique ſatisfaction to the Church, for committing ſome notorious action; and this is a part of Eccleſiaſticall diſcipline, called Penance: *Agenda eſt pœnitentia, ſecundùm modum ſuicuiuſque peccati*; Penance is to be done, according to the meaſure or manner of euery ones ſinne. And againe, *Reſtè conſtituuntur ab ijs qui Eccleſiæ præſunt, tempora pœnitentiæ*; times of Penance are rightly ordained, by thoſe which are Gouernours of the Church, ſaith Saint *Auſtin.* So the Church of *England* appoynts dayes when publique offendors ſhall doe publique Penance. I haue knowne it in my owne Countrey, when foure or fiue of a day haue beene conſtrayned to doe penance before the whole Aſſembly. And this is that confeſsion and penance which Saint *Auſtin* taught; which is alſo practiſed with approbation.

Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 65.

bation in the Church of *England*: neither doe thoſe places which you alledge out of *Auſtin*, proue any thing at all to the contrary: only when you find an erroneous and ſtrange tenent of the Nouatians, you call it a Proteſtant-like error: as if the Church of Rome were free from errour. (*Bona mulier, neſcit errare*:) Her ſmall faults are hereſies, with which Ile leaue her, and returne to confirme what hath beene deliuered, by theſe enſuing concluſions.

Firſt, That a neceſsity of auricular confeſsion of all our ſins in particular to a Prieſt, was not inſtituted by Chriſt nor his Apoſtles. This is granted by *Scotus*, that it is not *de iure diuino promulgato*. As for that place in *Iames*, *Auſtin* interprets it, of cõfeſsing our ſecret ſins to godly men, for our eaſe & conſolation only. But your auricular confeſsion was neuer inſtituted by God, nor yet of a long time practiſed in the Church, ſaith *Rhenanus*. And *Lumbard* is very plaine, ſpeaking of *Peters* conuerſiõ without any auricular confeſsion; (whereof *Ambroſe* ſaid, *Quod fleuerit inuenio, quid dixerit non inuenio*) It was not (ſaith he) then inſtituted. Therfore doe not you (Mr. *Brereley*) delude any hereafter, in making them beleeue that which your owne learned Doctors doe not beleeue.

In 4. ſent. diſt. 17. q. 1.

In Annotat. ad lib. Tertul. de pœnitent.

Lib. 4. ſentent. diſt. 17.

Secondly, That no priuate auricular confeſsion is neceſſary to ſaluation; becauſe men may obtaine pardon of their ſinnes without it, ſaith *Lumbard*. *Ore tacente, veniam interdum conſequimur*; God forgiues, where there is vnfaigned confeſsion of the heart, though there be not alwayes confeſsion of the mouth, as S. *Auſtin* ſpeakes vpon thoſe words of the 31. Pſalme (*Dixi, Pronunciabo aduerſus me, & tu dimiſiſti.*) *Dicere* (*pronunciabo*) *eſt pronunciare, quia corde pronunciauerit, & Deus audiuit vocem cordis*: To ſay (I will confeſſe) is to confeſſe, becauſe he had confeſt already in heart, and God heard the voyce of his heart. So that you ſee it is plaine, that Saint *Auſtin* held no neceſsity of auricular confeſsion; but that the confeſsion of the heart is ſufficient to obtaine remiſsion, and by conſequence, ſaluation. Neither, indeed, can we reade any neceſsity of it in the workes of any ancient Writer, till at leaſt

Lauant lachryma, delictum quod voce pudor eſt confiteri: ſaith Chryſoſt. tom. 4. de pœnitent. c. 12.

leaſt 800. yeeres after Chriſt; and then it begunne to bee mentioned in the workes of one *Albinus*, Scholler to *Bede*, and Maſter to *Charles* the great: and ſome 30. yeeres after, it was refined, in *Conc. Moguntino*, vnder *Gregorie* the fourth; But there was no publike Edict, concerning the neceſsity of auricular confeſsion, before the *Laterane* Councell, which might erre in this, as well as in other points. Are not your common Prieſts then far too blame, to tell the ignorant people, that they muſt either confeſſe all their ſinnes particularly vnto them, or elſe be damned; when as it is granted by Saint *Auſtin*, and ſome of your owne Writers, that it is not neceſſary to ſaluation?

Non dico vt confitearis conſeruo tuo, vt tibi exprobret; Deo dicito: ſaith the ſame Father, *Tom. 1. Hom. 2. in Pſ. 50.*

Thirdly, That Saint *Auſtin*, and the Church before him, and in his time, neither vſed it, nor held it neceſſary to bee vſed; *Neq; id ago*, (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*, ſpeaking of confeſſion) *verbis carnis, & vocibus, ſed verbis animæ, & clamore cogitationis*: Neither doe I this in any articulate voyce, nor with the words of fleſh, but with the words of my ſoule and imagination. And in another place hee ſayes; *Non homo irriſor meus eſt, cui loquor*: it is not man, my mocker, to whom I ſpeake: for what haue I to doe with men, that they ſhould heare my confeſsions, as though they were to heale my diſeaſes? Which plainely ouerthrowes Mr. *Brereley's* opinion. For firſt, this auricular confeſsion, priuate or publike, (more then hath beene granted) is not of diuine inſtitution, and therefore not neceſſary to ſaluation. Againe, Saint *Auſtin* neuer vſed it, and therefore, whether he taught the neceſsity of it or no, let any ordinary Reader iudge.

Lib. 10. conf. c. 2, 3.

Lib. 1. conf. c. 6.

All the places cited by you out of *Auſtin*, doe proue that confeſsion of our ſinnes knowne, particularly, vnknowne generally, to God and good men, whether Teachers or hearers, is neceſſary and profitable: which is alſo maintained by the Church of *England*: two places onely excepted, which ſeeme to proue it neceſſary to be done to the Prieſt onely: to which Ile anſwere and conclude.

The firſt is out of a Booke entituled, *De vera & falſa pœnitentia, c. 10.* but with what reaſon, to make good Saint

Auſtins

Auſtins Religion, I know not: when you might as well haue cited it, to haue proued the Religion of *Hugo Victorinus*: for that Booke is none of *Auſtins*, ſaith *Bellarmine*. Thus you ſee, your owne *Bellarmine* giues you a negatiue repulſe, but a ſufficient anſwere, with an (*iſte liber non eſt Auguſtini.*) *Lib. de ſcript. Eccleſ. ad annum* 420.

The ſecond is out of another Booke, *De viſitat. infirmorum, lib. 2. c. 4. Mirandum eſt, obijcientem toties repetiſſe, quod ſemel dixiſſe ſufficerat: ſed vt res eſt, numerum criminationis augere voluit, quia ſenſum variare non potuit:* as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes in a matter of the like kind. It is not ſufficient for Mr. *Brereley* once to erre, in citing other men in ſtead of *Auſtin*, but he perſeuers in it: (*errare humanum eſt; peeſeuerare diabolicum:*) for this booke *De viſitat. infirmorum, falsò attribuitur Auguſtino*; it is falſly attributed to *Auſtin*, ſaith *Bellarmine*. He hath neither ſhame nor honeſty in him, that obtrudes ſuch workes vpon vs in the name of *Auſtin*, ſaith *Eraſmus*. But you obtrude this booke vpon vs, as one of Saint *Auſtins* Workes: *Ergo* (conclude your ſelfe) to take this then as granted, That you would neuer haue coyned a new *Auſtin*, could you haue found one ſound place for your purpoſe in the old one. Ile conclude this Controuerſie with an exhortation to my louing Countrymen; both to thoſe that ſeduce, and to thoſe that are ſeduced, (whoſe freedome from the priſon of ignorance I chiefly deſire, that ſo their ſoules might bee ſaued in the Day of the Lord.) Doe not teach nor beleeue, that auricular confeſsion particularly to a Prieſt onely, is abſolutely neceſſary to ſaluation: it hath not beene taught by Chriſt, nor his Apoſtles, by none of the Fathers, for 800. yeeres after Chriſt, nor by the Church of *England*: but ſhewe the mortall wounds of your ſoules to the Phyſicion of the ſoule; beg the balme of Giliad from the hand of heauen, and confeſſe your ſinnes to Him that will not cruelly vpbraide you, but courteouſly cure you. *Reſponſ. ad art. ſicbi falsò impoſitos.* *Lib. de extre. vnct. c. 4.*

Concerning your Indulgences, and ſet dayes of pardon, (the vndoubted heyres of Purgatory) Saint *Auſtin* is ſilent: But confeſſe thy ſinnes to God, be heartily ſorry for them, and

and God will be mercifully indulgent, without gold or ſiluer: repent truely euery day, and euery day ſhall bee a day of pardon. Examine (Reader) before thou leaueſt this Page, what hath bin deliuered, and thou ſhalt ſee, that yet there is no difference in Religion, betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

CHAP. X. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach the vſe of extreme Vnction, as it is now vſed in the Church of Rome?*

SAint *Auſtin* (you ſay) teaches the vſe of extreme Vnction. A bare aſſertion, without authority, deſerues that cenſure which Saint *Anſtin* beſtowed vpon *Manicheus*. *Hæc Manicheus dixit, & abijt*: *Manicheus* ſaid theſe things, and went his way. So you ſay (Mr. *Brereley*) That Saint *Auſtin* teaches the vſe of extreme Vnction, as it is now vſed in the Romane Church: but you leaue it (as though all your poſitions were Axiomes in Diuinity) for ſome new Apollogiſt to proue or pleade. Weakeneſſe in Diſputation, ſteales away the credit of the action; depriues the Author (though painefull) of approbation; and for the moſt part, brings a ſcandall vpon that Religion which he vndertooke to defend. So Mr. *Brereley*, intending to maintaine, hath ſo wounded extreme Vnction, that vnleſſe ſome miraculous ſpell, or other ſpeedy remedy be applyed, it will hardly recouer either that life or credit that it had afore: and my truely-Noble Country-men of *Lancaſhire*, ſeeing Vnction brought into this extremity, will reiect it, as idle * foppery. For Saint *Auſtin* doth not once name extreme Vnction in any of his owne Workes; nor the Church of *England*: neither indeed doe you alledge any. As for thoſe three places which you haue borrowed out of

* (p)

Suarez,

Suarez, he himſelfe confeſſes that they be none of *Auſtins*. The firſt is *de Rectitud. Cathol. conuerſat.* And this is none of *Auſtins*, ſaith *Eraſmus*. *Bellarmine* doubts of it: but the Maſters of *Louaine* haue reiected it. The ſecond is the 215. *Serm. de tempore*: Which Sermon wants (*A.*) that is, *Auſtine* to be the Author; as both *Eraſmus* and *Lypſius* teſtifie. The third is, *de viſitat. infirm.* wich is falſly put vpon Saint *Auſtin*, ſaith *Bellarmine*. The Author of that Booke was neither *doctus* nor *diſertus*; learned nor eloquent, ſaith *Eraſmus*. Thus you ſee, your glorious title wanting authority, and being nothing but a title, is vaniſht away: your *Auſtin* is found to be ſome other Author; and you your ſelfe ſilenced with this old negatiue anſwer; *Non ſunt Auguſtini*, theſe are none of *Auſtins* Workes, neither is this *Auſtins* Religion.

Yet for thy ſake (courteous Reader) whoſoeuer thou art, that deſireſt to know the ancient truth, and tenent of the Primitiue Fathers about this queſtion, I will here adde a word or two for thy direction.

There is a two-fold Vnction mentioned by ancient Writers: the firſt was corporall, which was vſed in the Primitiue Church, ſo long as the miraculous gift of healing continued; ſo that when they vſed it, health euer followed: to ſhew it was a miraculous action. But in the Church of *Rome*, it is giuen to men halfe dead; and not to the end they might recouer, but to aſsure them of remiſſion of ſinnes, and to prepare them for glory: which is contrary to the cuſtome of the Primitiue Church. Againe, the miraculous act of healing (*vel ipſo confitente Pontifice*) ceaſed long agoe; therfore now there can be no good vſe of corporall vnctiō: neither was this receiued as a Sacrament amongſt the Fathers of the Primitiue Church; they thinking (and that truely) that it was inſtituted by the Apoſtles, as the Papiſts themſelues are of opinion; who had no authority to ordaine a Sacrament: ſo ſayes the Councell of Trent. And therefore they cannot, by the principles of their owne Religion, defend it to be a Sacrament. Moreouer, that anoynting which the Apoſtles vſed, was with

Hugo de vict. lib. 2. de Sacr. c. 2. Lumb. lib. 4. ſent. diſt. 23. Seſſ. 7. c. 1.

common oyle; but theirs muſt be holy oyle, adored with bowing of the knee, ann nine times ſaluted; thrice, Hayle, holy oyle; thrice, Hayle, holy Chryſme; and thrice, Hayle, holy Balme. Which ſuperſtitious cuſtome were ſomewhat tolerable amongſt Indians, Turkes, and Infidels; but in Chriſtians damnable.

The ſecond kind of Vnction mentioned in the Fathers, is ſpirituall, by the ſecret operation of the holy Ghoſt in the hearts of the faithfull. *Ad omnes Chriſtianos pertinet hæc vnctio*; This Vnction belongs to all Chriſtians, ſaith *Auſtin*. And this is that Vnction which is ſo highly commended by Saint *Auſtin*, in his Expoſition vpon the Epiſtle of *Iohn*, *Tract*. 4. *Vngimur enim modò in Sacramento*; We are now anoynted in the Sacrament. Which he vnderſtands not of the corporall, but of the ſpirituall Vnction; as he explaines himſelfe, commenting vpon thoſe words of our Sauiour Chriſt: *When you faſt, anoynt your heads, and waſh your hands, &c. Non enim rectè quiſquam præcepit, quamuis faciem quotidianâ conſuetudine lauemus, vnctis etiam capitibus cùm ieiunamus nos eſſe debere: Quod ſi turpiſſimum omnes fatentur, intelligendum eſt, hoc præceptum ad interiorem hominẽ pertinere*: No man can cõmand rightly, that although we waſh our faces dayly, that we ſhould therefore anoynt our heads when we faſt: Which thing, if all men will confeſſe to bee moſt filthy, wee muſt vnderſtand, that the commandement (of anoynting our heads) reſpects the inner man. Which place I take to bee a moſt plaine expoſition of Saint *Auſtins* mind in the reſt of his ſayings: For he thought it a filthy thing, that any mans head or face ſhould be anoynted with oyle; and therfore he ſayes, that Vnction properly belongs to the inner man. *Caput vngit, qui lætatur interiùs*: Hee which feeles in his ſoule the ſweete comfort of Gods Spirit, is truely *Vnctus*, anoynted, though viſible oyle neuer toucht him: and he which feeles it not, cannot be comforted nor eaſed with ten thouſand riuers of oyle. And this is the Religion of the ancient Fathers, eſpecially of Saint *Auſtin*, concerning Vnction. Which I deſire euery Chriſtian to remember, e-

Enarr. in Pſ. 26.

Lib. 2. de ſerm. Dom. in monte.

uen

nen as he tenders the good of his ſoule, that ſo he may not be ſeduced to put his confidence in any viſible oyle, eſpecially at the houre of death, not to runne to the Prieſt for ſanctified or holy oyle, (as they call it) but to cry to God, that he would let thee feele the ſweete operation of his ſacred Spirit in thy ſoule; to aſſure thee of ſaluation, to aſſiſt thee againſt Satans temptations, and to reſtore thee to thy former health, if it may ſtand with Gods glory and thy good: or elſe to gard thee out of this vale of miſery, into the Circle of Eternity.

CHAP. XI. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Ordination is properly a Sacrament?*

THE Church of *England*, taking this word Sacrament properly, holds, there are but two onely, and ſo does Saint *Auſtin*, as I haue already proued. For anſwere then to this queſtion: You muſt vnderſtand, that Saint *Auſtin* cals euery myſtery a Sacrament. So hee cals *Adams Ecſtaſis* in Paradiſe, *Magnum Sacramentum*, a great Sacrament. And writing vpon thoſe words of *Iohn*; *Vnctio docet vos de omnibus. Iam hîc videte* (ſaith he) *magnum Sacramentum, fratres*: here you may ſee a great Sacrament or myſtery. Which kinde of ſpeech is very vſuall with Saint *Auſtin*: and if you take the word (Sacrament) in this ſenſe, in reading Saint *Auſtin*, you may find aboue a hundred Sacraments. And ſo, ordination of Deacons, Presbyters, and Biſhops, (for other kinds, *præcedente tempore, ſibi conſtituit Eccleſia Romana*, (ſaith *Lumbard*) Penance, Matrimony, and preaching of the Word, are called by Saint *Auſtin* Sacraments, (i.) Myſteries: where there are outward actions of men, and an inward concurring of Gods bleſſed Spirit. It is certaine, that

Tom. 3. lib. 9. de Gen. ad lit. 6. vll.

Tract. 3. expoſit. epiſt. Ioh.

Lib. 4. ſent. diſt. 24.

that this ordination to the Office of the Ministerie, is μυστήριον μέγα, a diuine Institution, a most high and heauenly Mystery (of which I haue spoken at large in a seueral Treatise, which I intend er'e long to publish, for the good of those that shall hereafter be called to this office.) And therfore Saint *Austin* cals it a Sacrament or Mystery. Neyther is this contradicted by the Church of *England*, who allowes as much as Saint *Austin* hath taught: That it is a diuine Mystery; and therefore, taking the word (Sacrament) in a large sense, it may be called a Sacrament. So that yet there is no difference in Religion betweene S. *Austin* and the Church of *England*.

See my Booke intituled, The young-man's authority for his admission into the Ministery.

Lib. 2. cont. epist. Parm. c. 31.

SECT. 2.

Whether doth Saint Austin *teach, that there ought to be a Superioritie amongst the Clergie.*

THat there hath beene, is, and ought to bee a difference betweene Bishops and Presbyters, hath euer beene the tenent of the Church of *England*; and so it is of *Austin*. *Corripiuntur à propositis suis subditi fratres:* Let the inferiour brethren be corrected by their chiefe Gouernour or Superintendant. Implying a difference among the Clergie, some gouerning, others to be gouerned. And the reason is, because equality of persons in the body either Ciuill or Ecclesiastical, could yet neuer consist with policy; it beeing the vnhappy mother of that more vngratious child, Dissension. And therfore, as *Euseb.* testifies, Church-Gouernours were diuided in *summos, medios, & infimos*; or into Bishops, Presbytors, and Deacons. And *Hieorme*, in an Epistle of his *ad Euagrium*, shewes, that these three Degrees continued in the Church of *Alexandria*, from *Marke* to *Dionysius*. And *Ireneus*, his Ancient by two hundred yeeres and more, sayes, It was so in all the Churches in the world. Which caused Saint *Austin* to condemne the

Lib. de cor. & gra. c. 15.

ἴσοτες ἔστιν ἀναρχίαι προξένος. *Arist.*

Lib. 4. c. 1.

Lib. 4. c. 63.

the contrary opinion, as an Arrian Hereſie: ſo that in this queſtion there is no difference betweene him and the Church of *England*. *Lib. de har. ad Quodu. hereſ. 53.*

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Prieſts may not marry?*

THat it is lawfull for Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, as for all other Chriſtian men, to marry at their owne diſcretion, is the Doctrine and Religion of the Church of *England*: and the ſame is taught by Saint *Auſtin*; who reprouing certaine Heretiques called *Apoſtolici*, becauſe they would not receiue ſuch Clergymen into their fellowſhip, as had Wiues, ſayes: *Quales habet Eccleſia Catholica & Monachos & Clericos plurimos*: The Catholique Church (ſaith *Auſtin*) hath many both married Monkes and Prieſts. Therefore, by the authority of the Catholique Church in Saint *Auſtins* time, Clergymen might marry. And it ſeemes, Maſter *Brereley* did beleeue this when hee writ his Booke, which cauſed him to alledge nothing at large out of *Auſtin* to proue the contrary; but onely the Decrees of ſome Councels, which cannot proue Saint *Auſtins* Religion. So that becauſe Maſter *Brereley* obiects nothing, I haue nothing to anſwere; but onely the expectation of the Reader, who will deſire (I know) to be acquainted with the ancient truth of this, as well as of the reſt; for whoſe direction, this enſuing diſcourſe ſhall manifeſt Saint *Auſtins* Religion concerning this queſtion. *Article 32.* *De hæreſ. c. 40.*

Firſt of all, it ought to be granted, that Saint *Auſtin* highly commends chaſtity: *Nulla carnis fœcunditas, ſanctæ virginitati carnis etiam comparari poteſt*; No fertility of the fleſh can be compared to the virginity of the fleſh. It is ſtyled by diuers of the ancient Fathers, to be the Queene of Vertues, Siſter to the Angels, Heauens gratuity, di- *Lib. de ſanct. Virg. cap. 3.*

uine Chastitie: and ought highly to bee admired where it is, but not to be compelled to appeare to be, where it is not: *Lib. 6. contr. Parm.* *Nam vbi necessitas imponitur castitati, authoritas datur libidini; nec casta est, quæ metu cogitur*; Where necessitie is imposed vpon chastitie, there way is giuen to lust; neyther can any be chaste, who is compelled thereunto by feare, saith *Austin*. Single life ought to be voluntary, and not necessary, saith *Optatus*. None therefore in those *Lib. 1. de Clr. cap. 18.* dayes were compelled to be chaste. And *Bellarmine* confesses, that it is not of diuine institution. Therefore the Easterne Churches to this day doe giue the same liberty of marriage to their Clergy, which the Church of *England* doth; not through the libertie of the Popes dispensation (as *Bellarmine* would haue it) but by the freedome of Christs direction, by the mouth of his messenger: *Melius est nubere quàm vri*; It is better to marry than burne. And Saint *Austin* commends three sorts of chastitie; *virginalem, coniugalem, & vidualem*: so that if a man can keepe any of these, eyther the chastity of single life, wedlocke, or widdowhood, hee does as much as *Austin* would haue him: though hee commend the first chiefly (*& qui capere potest, capiat;*) (and hee that can take it, let him take it;) yet it is *dum in hypothesi*, with this condition: *Si non possunt ita continere, nubant*; If they cannot so containe, let them marry. Hee neuer mentions any constrayned virginity, without the gift of continency; who in his owne person, being not endowed with virginall-chastity: *Lib. 6. Confess. cap. 3.* *Calibatum Ambrosij tanquam laboriosum admirabatur*; Hee did admire the single life of *Ambrose*, as a thing difficill and painefull. Which caused him afterwards to pray for chastity of single life in some who had the gift: in others, the chastity of wedlocke: *Et quibus* *De bono coniug. cap. 21.* *non dedisti virginalem, da, Domine, castitatem coniugalem; si non castitatem Iohannis, saltem Abrahæ; si non in opere, tamen in habitu*; and to whom thou hast not giuen the chastity of single life, Lord giue them the chastity of wedlocke: if not the chastity of *Iohn*, yet the chastity of *Abraham*; if not in act, yet in habit.

Secondly,

Secondly, Saint *Auſtin* neuer taught that marriage was prophane or vncleane to any: but condemnes all thoſe, *qui appetendo virginitatem, nuptias tanquam adulterium deteſtandas eſſe putabant*; who in louing virginity, do thinke marriage to be abhorr'd as Adultery, as the Manichees did, who forbade their Prieſts marriage, as Saint *Auſtin* teſtifies; and in the very ſame manner as you doe at this day; you tolerate it in the Laity, but forbid it in the Clergy: ſo they did ſuffer it *in auditoribus*, in their Laity, but could not endure it *in Electis* (i.) their Prieſts. Againe, you doe ſo highly commend virginitie in the Clergy (highly indeed to be eſteemed, if voluntary) that you condemne marriage as Adultery; which Saint *Auſtin* neuer did. And I could wiſh the common people would conſider this, which perhaps might moue them, not ſo harſhly to cenſure the married Clergy, as heretofore out of ignorance they haue done: for all thoſe doe offend againſt the rule of Saint *Auſtin*, which eyther diſprayſe virginity, or condemne marriage; *Quod caſtum eſt, ſic ametur, vt quod verum eſt non negetur*; Let not the loue of chaſtitie bring Gods truth in opprobry: for marriage is *actus laboris, non criminis, tribulationis carnis, non turpitudinis*; an act of paine, not of blame; of trouble, not of ſinne: and therefore Saint *Paul* dehorts from marriage; *non tanquam à re mala & illicita*, (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) *ſed tanquam ab oneroſa & moleſta*; not as from an euill thing and vnlawfull, but as from a troubleſome. Let Saint *Auſtins* exhortation rectifie your miſſe-led opinion. *Sectatores & ſectatrices ſacræ virginitatis admoneo, vt bonum ſuum ita præferant nuptijs, ne malum indicent nuptijs*; I admoniſh the followers of virginity, that they ſo preferre their chaſtity to marriage, that they doe not iudge marriage to be euill. For, if Saint *Auſtin* be Iudge, you muſt not condemne marriage in any that cannot containe.

De bono coniug. cap.10.

Lib. de mori. Eccleſ. Cath. c. vlt. & Epiſt. 74.

Thirdly Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that many of the Clergy did containe themſelues, and liued vnmarried, as Saint *Auſtin* himſelfe and *Ambroſe*: ſo *Paul* and *Barnabas* liued in vnmarried, ſaid the Centuriſts, *Cent. 1. lib. 2. cap. 7.* though

Lib. 1. ſoliloq. cap. 10.

Lib. 6. Conf. cap. 3.

Lib. de ſanct. Virg. cap. 16.

Epiſt. ad Philad. though *Ignatius* denyes it. Neyther was this of abſolute neceſsitie, but of free liberty ioyned with greater conueniency. So wee commend it where it is, but dare not conſtraine it where it is not; *non vt vos cogam*, I will not compell you, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*: Willingly to embrace it, was commendable, but to compell any to ſingle life, was a ſtrange Doctrine in Saint *Auſtins* time; yea ſo ſtrange, that he calls it the doctrine of Deuils: *Multùm intereſt inter hortantes ad virginitatem, & prohibentes nubere*; There is a great difference betweene thoſe that exhort to virginity, and thoſe that forbid to marry. The firſt (ſaith *Auſtin*) is the doctrine of the Apoſtles, the other of Diuels.

Lib. de bon. vidu. cap. 5.

Tom. 6. lib. 30. cont. Fauſt. Manic. cap. 6.

Laſtly, Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that it is lawfull for the Clergy to marry: *Diſpenſatorem Eccleſiæ non licèat ordinare, niſi vnius vxoris virum*, (to render it in Maſter *Brereley's* owne Engliſh:) It is not lawfull to ordaine a Miniſter of the Church, vnleſſe hee bee the Husband of one Wife. Which *Theophilact* vnderſtands literally. Saint *Peter* and *Philip* were married men: and Saint *Auſtin* ſayes, that many both Monkes and Prieſts were married in his time. Moſt of the ancient Fathers (*Hierome*, and *Tertullian* a Montaniſt, excepted) doe agree with Saint *Auſtin* in this opinion, that as the *Nicene* Councell left it, it ſhould be free for the Clergy (*in vniuſcuiuſque arbitrium reiecit*, ſaith the Hiſtorian of that Councell) to marry or not to marry; as they ſhall iudge the ſame to ſerue better for godlineſſe; neyther can this liberty be taken away by any decree of man.

De bono coniug. cap. 18.

In 1. Epiſt. ad Timoth. cap. 3. Cont. 1. lib. 2. cap. 7. Chryſ. hom. 2. in ca. 1. Epiſt. ad Titum. Ambroſ. Ep. 82. Bern. Serm. 66. in Cant.

To that place which Maſter *Brereley* alledges in the Margent of his Booke, I anſwere, That Saint *Auſtin* vnderſtands there, *caſtitatem coniugalem non virginalem*, and that not ſo much of the fleſh as of the minde: and therefore hee ſayes: *Solemus eis proponere continentiam Clericorum*; Wee are wont to propoſe vnto them the continency of Clerkes. Now, if hee may be his owne expoſitor, *Continentia* is *virtus animi, non corporis*; Continency is a vertue of the minde, not of the body, *de bono coniug. c. 21.*

Lib. 2. de adult. coniug. cap. 20.

And

And this continency (*ſi non virginalis, ſaltem coniugalis*: if not in act, yet in habit; if not that of *Iohn*, yet that of *Abraham*, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes) is neceſſarily required in the Clergy: which is all any can gather from Saint *Auſtins* Workes; though his owne practice was more ſeuere, ſaith *Poſſidonius*: when hee had ſowed his wilde oates, and ſpent his youthfull dayes. For in his youth it is certaine that hee was vnchaſte, inſomuch that hee kept a Concubine, by whom hee had a Childe, as hee teſtifies of himſelfe; yet afterwards became the moſt renowned amongſt the Fathers: and about the thirtieth yeere of his age, determined to haue married a Wife, though *Alippius* perſwaded him to the contrary; whoſe counſell hee obeyed, and retyred himſelfe from the company of women. Where I leaue him, wiſhing that all the adulterous Maſſe of vnchaſte Prieſts in the Romane Church, were eyther heartily chaſte, priuily caſtrate, or publiquely eſpouſed. For this was the publique requeſt of *Albertus* Duke of *Bauaria*, in the late Conuenticle of *Trent*: *Paphnutius*-like hee deſired to haue freed the Italian Clergy from the notorious impropriation of incontinency. But it may be, Maſter *Brereley*, you had rather burne than marry,

De vita Auguſt. cap. 26.

Lib. 4. confeſſ. cap. 2. & lib. 6. cap. 15.

——*Per me licebit;*
Sed ſine me ibis in ignem.

And here (Chriſtian Reader) thou haſt the ancient truth of this queſtion, maintayned in the Church of *England*, and taught by Saint *Auſtin*; from whence thou maiſt eaſily conclude, that yet there is no difference in Religion betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Chap. XII. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Matrimonie is a Sacrament of the New Teſtament?*

THis word (*Sacrament*) may be taken two wayes. Firſt, *ſtrictè, pro obſignatione gratiæ & peccatorum remiſſionis*; and ſo (ſaith Saint *Auſtin.*) The ſacraments of the new Teſtament are feweſt in number, onely two, Baptiſme and the Lords Supper: and in this ſence Matrimony is no Sacrament. Secondly, it may be taken *Latè* for euery myſtery: So the viſion of the ſeuen Starres is called a Sacrament, and the myſtery of the Whore of *Babylon*. And ſpeaking of *Noahs* Floud, hee calls it *diluuij Sacramentum*: and in this ſence it is that Saint *Auſtin* calls Matrimony a Sacrament; yea euery myſtery a Sacrament: *Signa ad res diuinas pertinentia, Sacramenta appellantur*; all thoſe things whoſe inſtitution is diuine, and the ſignification myſterious, are by Saint *Auſtin* called Sacraments: as he explaines himſelfe in his fift Epiſtle. But in another place ſpeaking of Baptiſme and the Lords Supper, hee ſayes: *Hæc ſunt Eccleſiæ gemina Sacramenta*: theſe are the two Sacraments of the Church; which haue any promiſe of applying or ſealing vnto vs our reconciliation with God: which is alſo the Religion of the Church of *England*; as I haue already proued. Now to your obiections I anſwere, by granting that Saint *Auſtin* calls Matrimony a Sacrament, as the word is taken largely & improperly for a myſtery: which hee did chiefly to defend the dignity of Matrimony, againſt the erronious aſſertions of the Manichees, who ſayd, (as you doe at this day) that Marriage was prophane and vncleane in the Prieſts. So your *Sanctioli*, your *Electi*,

Lib. de Catech. Rudib. c. 19.

Epiſt. 5.

In Symbo. ad Catech.

Electi, your Prieſts, muſt not bee defiled with the prophane ſacrament of Matrimony: you will haue it to bee a ſacrament conferring grace to the Receiuer, and yet vnfit for your holy Prieſts, leſt they ſhould haue ouermuch grace: but that it is not a ſacrament properly and vniuocally, is granted by your owne Writers: onely they hold it to be a ſacrament, as the word is taken *Latè & minùs principaliter*. Neyther heere can they agree about the matter and forme of this improper ſacrament: what ſhould be the external viſible elements, which Saint *Auſtin* requires in a ſacrament (*accedat verbum ad elementum, & fit ſacramentum*) when in Matrimony there is no outward element; and therefore ſome ſay that the firſt words pronounced (as I *Iohn* take thee *Ellen*) are the matter: and the ſecond words (as I *Ellen* take thee *Iohn*) are the forme of Matrimony. But heere *verbum* and *elementum* are both one; which cannot make a ſacrament: and therefore the Canoniſts ſay, that conſent is the matter, and words expreſsing it, the forme. But this is *vaporoſum quoddam elementum*, for the moſt part raſhly and vnaduiſedly giuen, and therefore no fit matter for a ſacrament: which is contradicted by a third opinion, which holds that conſent is the forme, and the act of generation the matter: and ſo you may make it a ſacrament, the Prieſt being the Agent to conſecrate and perfit the whole ſacrament, both for matter and forme; by procuring the Brides conſent, (there is the forme;) to lend him her honeſty for a night, (there is the matter:) and in this ſence there being conſent and action, matter and forme, I would to God you did not make it ſo often a ſacrament of darkneſſe, as it is reported you doe.

Cap. in 4. Sent. diſt. 26. Durand. ibid. q. 3. Mart. Ledeſ. tom. 4. diſp. 44. art. 8.

Againe, if you take the word ſacrament in this large and improper ſence, you ſhall finde that Saint *Auſtin* teaches Matrimony to be a ſacrament or myſtery, as well of the Old Teſtament as of the New. Neyther can any bee ſo blinded in his vnderſtanding, as to ſuppoſe it to bee a ſacrament of the New Teſtament, ſeeing it was inſtituted in Paradiſe, confirmed in the Olde Teſtament, and con-

De bon. coniug. cap. 18. De bon. Viduit. cap. 7.

tinued in the Church: and Saint *Auſtin* findes as great a myſtery in that of the Old, as in this of the New Teſtament; inſomuch that he calls their Polygamie, *ſacramentum nuptiarum de bono coniug. cap.* 18. which plainly contradicts *Bellarmine*, who holds it to be a ſacrament onely of the New Teſtament, againſt many of his owne Church. To conclude, Saint *Auſtin* holds it to be no ſacrament properly; to be no ſacrament of the New Teſtament: and ſo does the Church of *England*. There is no difference then concerning this queſtion, betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Pet. à Soto. Lect. 2. Hales diſt. 26. art. 1. Ronan. diſt. 26. q. 2. Hug. de ſanct. vict. lib. 1. de ſacram. par. 8. cap. 13.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that in caſe of diuorce vpon Adultery, the innocent partie may not marry another?*

IT is true, that in caſe of diuorce, Saint *Auſtin* thought that the innocent party might not marry another: and he giues two reaſons of his opinion. Firſt, becauſe the bond of marriage is not broken by fornication; for then the nocent party might marry as well as the innocent; if the bond were broken, they were both looſe, *Lib. 2. de Adulter. coniug. cap. 4. 5. &c.* Secondly, becauſe there ought euen to be hope of reconciliation, *ibid. cap. 9.* both which are thus confirmed, becauſe that if they be once reconciled, they may come and liue together againe as man and wife, without any new marriage, which they could not doe, had the bond of the former marriage beene quite broke: So that after diuorce, neyther party ought to marry againe in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement: Neyther doth the Church of *England* contradict this: what priuate men haue taught to the contrary, belongs to them, not to mee to maintaine. So that here there is no difference between Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

CHAP.

Chap. XIII. §.1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that man hath free-will now, to doe good of himſelfe?*

THe opinion of the Church of *England* concerning this queſtion, is laid downe in the 10. Article of her Religion: That the condition of man after the fall is ſuch, that he cannot turne and prepare himſelfe by his owne naturall ſtrength, &c. Wherefore we haue no power to doe good workes acceptable to God, without the grace of God, &c. And Saint *Auſtin* teaches the very ſame: *Habemus liberum arbitrium, ſed ipſo nihil poſſumus, niſi nos adiuuet Ille qui iubet*: We haue free-will, but by it we can doe nothing, vnleſſe He help vs that commands vs. *Enarr. in Pſal. 138.*

But Mr. *Brereley* ſayes, that in this point Saint *Auſtin* agrees with the Catholike *Roman* Church. Where let the Reader obſerue by the way, that a contradiction is a fit *Exordium* for a nature truely Ieſuited: and that the maine proppe of his poſition is a fallacy: *A bene diuiſis ad male conjuncta*: He would haue the Church to be (as it is indeed) Vniuerſall and Catholike, and yet limits it to the patticular Church of *Rome*: for to ſay Catholike-*Romane*, is as much as to ſay, Vniuerſall-particular, which makes but a iarring ſound in the eares of any meane Logician. Termes of contradiction admit no vnion: ſo that it muſt needs be either a figuratiue fallacy, or a fooliſh ſpeech, to call it The Catholike-*Romane* Church; when as the *Romane* Church, if it were a true Church, could but be a part of the Catholike Church. Now that Saint *Auſtin* teaches contrary to the *Romane* Church in this queſtion, & ioynes word for word with the Church of *England*, I ſhall (by Gods helpe) make it very plaine, in this enſuing anſwere. And for the better vnderſtanding of Saint *Auſtin*, let the

The ancient Philoſophers could doe no good vertuous actions, becauſe they wanted true piety: ſaith S. *Auſtin, lib. 1. Retract. c. 3.*

Reader conſider that Saint *Auſtin* writ *de libero arbitrio*, of free-will, againſt two ſorts of Heretiques. Firſt, againſt the Manichees; and then he proues that man had free-will in the ſtate of perfection; which we maintaine. Secondly, againſt the Pelagians; and then hee proues that man hath no free-will to doe good of himſelfe, in the ſtate of corruption; which is the queſtion in hand, and may be contayned in this one concluſion: That Saint *Auſtin* teaches that man after his fall hath no freedome of will to doe good, without the grace of God preuenting him, and working it in him. This is ſo euident, that it may be proued out of euery Tome of his Workes.

Tom.1.lib.1. Retract.cap.9. Lib.2.c.8. & cap.20. Lib.3.cap.2. Firſt, *Homo libero arbitrio cadere potuit, non ſurgere; Dei gratiâ quiſque liberatur*: Man cannot riſe by his owne free-will, vnleſſe it be made free by the grace of God: the good vſe of free-will is from God.

Tom.2.Epiſt. 46.ad Val. Secondly, *Secundùm hanc fidem intelligite librum meum, vt neque negetis Dei gratiam, neque liberum arbitrium ſic defendatis, vt à Dei gratia ſeparatis, tanquam ſine illa vel cogitare aliquid, vel agere ſecundùm Deum vllâ ratione poſſimus, quod omninò non poſſumus*: According to this faith vnderſtand my Booke, that yee neyther deny the grace of God, nor ſo defend free-will, that yee ſeparate it from the grace of God, as though without it wee could eyther thinke or doe any good thing, which by no meanes wee can. Our free-will is able to doe no good without the grace of God. Whether it be to turne to good, to perſeuer in good, or to attaine to good, free-will (ſaith *Auſtin*) without the grace of God, auailes nothing.

Epiſt.47.ante medium.

Tom.3. Encb. ad Laurent. cap.30. Thirdly, *Quid enim boni operari poteſt perditus, niſi quantùm fuerit à perditione liberatus? nunquid libero voluntatis arbitrio?* Can man worke any good by his free-will? *Hoc abſit* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*;) farre be it from any man ſo to thinke. And a little after; *Victore peccato, amiſſum eſt liberum arbitrium; gratiâ ſalui facti eſtis, &c.* When ſinne got the victory, free-will was loſt; yee are ſaued by grace. *Lib.de Sp.& lit.ad Mar.c.3.* And in another place, *Neque liberum arbitrium quicquam, niſi ad peccandum valet, &c.* It is a miſerable free-

dome,

dome, that is free in nothing but to sinne.

Fourthly, *Bonum quod vult, non facit, qui nondum est sub gratia:* there is no good done by any man, without the speciall helpe of Gods grace: the will is free, but not to doe good, vnlesse it be helpt by grace. *Tom.4.lib.1.ad Simpl. Sol. quæst.2.*

Fiftly, *Peccauit primâ naturâ, sed largiore gratiâ liberatur*; Our will was taken captiue by the fall, and must be freed by grace. *A bono potest declinare voluntas, vt faciat malum, quod fit libero arbitrio; & à malo, vt faciat bonum, quod non fit sine diuino adiutorio:* Man may turne from good to euill by free-will, and from euill to good by Gods helpe, not by freedome of our owne will. *Tom.5.lib.22. de Ciuit. Dei, cap.30. Lib.15.cap.21.*

Sixtly, *Miser ego homo* (saith hee vpon the words of Saint *Paul:*) *quis me liberabit de corpore huius mortis, nisi gratia Dei per Iesum Christum?* Miserable man that I am, who can deliuer mee from the body of this death, but the grace of God by Iesus Christ? And presently after, *Propter gratiam Dei qua liberat nos à lege peccati & mortis, ad iustitiam conuersi liberamur*; We are made free, not by our owne free-will, but by the grace of God. *Tom.6.disp.2. cont.Fortunat.*

Seuenthly, *Voluntas humana non libertate consequitur gratiam, sed gratia potius libertatem:* Grace is not obtained by free-will, but our will is truely freed by grace. If man after the fall haue free-will to doe good of himselfe, then Christ (saith *Austin*) dyed in vaine. And in another Tract of his, hee sayes, that *bonum propositum non potuisset esse in homine, nisi præcederet gratia*; No good thought could be in man, vnlesse grace did precede. *Quid mihi obtendis liberum arbitrium? Deus humanas liberat voluntates:* Why doest thou plead free-will? God doth free the wills of men. And lastly, (all the testimonies that might heere be alledged, would make a Volume;) *Liberum arbitrium captiuatum* (saith Saint *Austin*) *non nisi ad peccatum valet; ad iustitiam verò nisi diuinitùs liberatum adiutumque non valet:* Our wills after the fall are free in nothing but to sinne. Answere to these plaine places, or yeeld that Saint *Austin* was the greatest aduersary that euer was to this Church of *Rome*, in this opinion. *Tom.7.lib.de corr.& gra.ad Valent.c.8. Lib.de præd.& gra.cap.9. Lib.de nat.& grat.cont. Pelag. cap.40. Lib.2.cont. duas Epist.Pelag.c.6. & lib.3.cap.8.*

Eighth'ly,

Tom.8. enarr. in Pſalm. 26. & enarrat. 2. Pſalm. 138.

Eighthly, *Forte dices mihi, Ambula: liberum arbitrium tibi dedi: Noli de te præſumere* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin.*) *Voluntatem quidem mihi liberam dediſti, ſed ſine te, nihil eſt mihi meus conatus*; Peraduenture thou wilt ſay vnto me, Walke I haue giuen thee free-will: Doe not preſume on thy ſelfe. Indeed thou haſt giuen mee free-will, but without thee my indeuour is nothing. God hath giuen to man a will free from coaction; but it is himſelfe by his grace, that makes man actually free to will good.

Tom.9. expoſit. in Euang. tract. 53.

Ninthly, *Ecce dico & ego, quòd qui tam ſuperbè ſapiunt, vt ſua voluntatis viribus tantùm exiſtiment eſſe tribuendum, &c. hi non poſſunt credere in Chriſtum,* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin:*) Behold, and I ſay, that they which are ſo proudly wiſe to thinke ſo much ought to be attributed to the ſtrength of their owne free-will, theſe men cannot beleeue in Chriſt.

Tom.10. Serm. 1. de ver. Apoſt.

Tenthly, *Hoc modo ergo oſtendere voluit Deus homini, quid valeat liberum arbitrium ſine Deo:* By this meanes God would ſhew to man, what free-will could doe without God. *O malum liberum arbitrium ſine Deo, &c.* Man hath a miſerable freedome of will without Gods grace; hee is free from grace, and the ſeruant onely of ſin: which

Serm.6. de verb. Apoſt. Serm.7. & Serm.13.

cauſed Saint *Auſtin* to complaine of thoſe proud natures which boaſted (as you doe at this day) of the ſtrength of their owne free-will: *O humana natura! O Adam! quando ſanus eras, non ſtetiſti & tuis viribus ſurrexiſti?* O thou proud off-ſpring of falling *Adam*, when thou waſt aliue thou couldſt not ſtand, and now beeing dead, canſt thou riſe by thy owne ſtrength?

And here you haue the concluſion confirmed out of euery Tome in *Auſtin:* which I haue beene the more willing to cite: *vt vel mole authoritatis, veſtra obteratur infidelitas* (as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes) that weight of authority might ſuppreſſe theſe new conceits of infidelity; that whereas you beare the world in hand, that Saint *Auſtin* was of your Religion, it might appeare to all the world, that in the weightieſt poynts wherein you diſſent from the Church of *England*, Saint *Auſtin* was your greateſt enemy, who teaches (as you ſee) firſt, That man after his fall

Lib.3. de lib. arbit. cap.21.

hath

hath free-will onely to ſinne: *liberum arbitrium captiuatum non niſi ad peccatū valet.* To this our will is fit, which is called free, *vt malè agendo ſit damnabilis ancilla:* that by doing ill, it may damne it ſelfe. Secondly, that mans will is made free to doe good by the grace of God, *vt liberum ſit ad rectè faciendum, Dei gratia liberatur:* that it may be free to doe good, it is freed by the grace of God. Thirdly, that mans will in the act of conuerſion, doth co-operate with Gods grace, not of it ſelfe, but as it is enabled thereunto, by the preuenting and working-grace of God: *Nos ergo volumus, ſed Deus operatur in nobis & velle: nos operamur, ſed Deus operatur in nobis & operari:* and ſo the will of man may be conſidered eyther in the firſt act of conuerſion, before grace hath wrought vpon the wil, and then (it hauing onely *potentiam paſſiuam*) doth not moue, vnleſſe it be *motu retrogrado*, from God and goodneſſe: or in the ſecond act, when grace hath wrought vpon it; and then the will of man begins to be willing, & to haue an actiue power to receiue grace willingly, and to co-operate with it; *ex nolentibus gratia facit volentes*, ſaith *Auſtin*, vnwilling wee are in the firſt, but willing in the ſecond act: So that man may be ſaid to moue three ſeuerall wayes. Firſt, *motu retrogrado*, from God by the act of his owne free-will. Secondly, *motu trepidationis*, trembling at the ſight of his blacke ſoule, and crimſon ſins. And laſtly, *motu mixto*, partly to good, and partly to euill; what good ſoeuer is in man, be it of will or worke, is an effect of Gods grace. *Omne opus bonum gratia Dei præcedit*, ſaith *Auſtin*; Gods grace goes before euery good worke. There is alſo a liberty from co-action, which is eſſentiall to the will of man: and a liberty from ſinne, not from being, but from reigning; which is proper to a regenerate man onely; who hath free-will to doe good, being enabled by the grace of God: which is eyther *præueniens, operans, co-operans*, or *perficiens*. The firſt, prepares the will; the ſecond, turnes it; the third, makes the will perſeuer in willing good; and the laſt perfects it; *vt ergo velimus, ſine nobis operatur Deus; cùm autem volumus, & ſic* vo-

Lib. 1. Retr. c. 26. *Lib. 1. de gra. & lib. arbit. c. 16.*

Lib. 2. de bon. perſeuer. c. 13. *Lib. de dog. Eccleſ. cap. 6.*

Epiſt. 107.

Epiſt. 106.

volumus vt faciamus, nebiſcum co-operatur: ſine illo operante vt velimus, vel co-operante cùm volumus, nihil valemus, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes. And this is the ſumme and ſubſtance of Saint *Auſtins* Religion, concerning this queſtion; being the very ſame which is maintained at this day by the Church of *England*: Neyther doe your quotations (Maſter *Brereley*) proue any thing at all to the contrary. The three firſt doe proue that man hath free-will, which we deny not; onely wee ſay it is ſo free, as that without grace, it auailes nothing to help vs towards God or goodneſſe, and ſo ſayes Saint *Auſtin* in the fourth place by you cited: *Sana fides Catholica, neque liberum arbitrium negat, &c. neque tantum ei tribuit, vt ſine gratia Dei valeat aliquid, ſine vt ex malo conuertatur in bonum, &c.* This is the ſound Catholique faith, neyther to deny free-will, nor to giue ſo much to it, as to ſay, that without grace it auailes any thing. Now, we neyther deny free-will, nor giue ſo much vnto it: therefore in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, we hold the ſound Catholique faith; ſo that if you ſay that man hath free-will to doe good by grace onely, then you doe not differ from the Church of *England*. But if you hold as the late Councell of *Trent* hath decreed (and with it you dare not but beleeue) that man hath free-will of himſelfe to doe good, then you contradict Saint *Auſtin*; and therefore he ſends you word, that you do not hold nor beleeue the true Catholique faith; and by conſequent, you are no members of the truely-Catholique Church.

Lib. 1. de gra. et lib. arbit. c. 16.

Pag. 47. Valent.

To ſhut vp all in a word. To deny free-will, was a hereſie of the Manichees: to ſay that free-will is able to doe good of it ſelfe without grace, was a hereſie of the Pelagians. Fly theſe two extremes, (as Saint *Auſtin* admoniſhes you) *& medio tutiſſimus ibis*: being freed from that groſſe opinion of more than ſemi-Pelagianiſme, all forepaſt diuiſion ſhall ioyne in one melodious harmony, to beget vnion, and all our iarring lines ſhall meet in the center of amity. But if this preuaile not with you, it muſt needes be made knowne to all thoſe that deſire to know the ancient truth, that in this poynt Saint *Auſtin* is your greateſt aduer-

aduersary; who ioynes with the Church of *England*, to ascribe the glory in the action of mans conuersion, to God onely: *Tutiores viuimus, si totum Deo damus, non autem si nos illi ex parte, & nos nobis ex parte committimus.* So that yet there is no difference in Religion betweene Saint *Austin* and the Church of *England*. *Lib. de dog. Eccles. cap. 6. Lib. 9. de Gen. ad lit. cap. 18.*

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Austin *teach, that wee are iustified by good workes before God?*

THis is the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, That we are accounted righteous before God, onely for the merit of our Lord and Sauiour Iesus Christ, by faith, and not for our owne workes or deseruings, &c. *Artic. 11.* And it is the plaine Doctrine and Religion of S. *Austin*; *Non enim merito suis, tanquam ex operibus, sed Dei gratiâ, sic iustificatus est homo*: Man is not iustified by workes, but by faith and the grace of God. *Tom. 4. exposit. propos. ex Epist. ad Rom. pag. 1193.* Against which, Mr. *Brereley* proues nothing: onely hee sayes, That *Austin* teaches a man is iustified by good workes: But is so farre from prouing it, that he goes not about to proue any such matter. For first he vrges Saint *Austin*, saying, that *gratia Dei à morte primi hominis, ad vitam secundi hominis transfert, non solùm peccata delendo, verùm etiam ad recte vivendum, &c.* *Epist. 106.* Therefore St. *Austin* teaches (saith he) that we are iustified by good workes. How doth this follow, We are iustified *per gratiam Dei*, by the grace of God, saith *Austin*; *ergo* by good workes? Neither is the second any thing inferior to this; *Nemo liberat à vulneribus trucidatoris, nisi gratiâ Saluatoris*; Neither is any man freed and iustified but by the grace of God, saith Saint *Austin*; therfore by good works; which must be Master *Brereley's* conclusion, if he will conclude any thing to the purpose: *& quis talia fando, à risu abstineat?* A meane Logician may steale away the conclusion without hurting his Syllogisme; his chiefe intended *Epist. 105.*

illation, being nothing but a contradiction to the premiſes, (*& riſum teneatis amici?*) I could here eaſily take that occaſion which you haue giuen me, to diſplay in you (Maſter *Brereley*) a great imperfection, but a word ſhall ſuffice to giue you warning; and a little ſhall ſerue for anſwer to your nothing. Workes then may be conſidered eyther before or after faith: To works going before faith you do not attribute iuſtification, but onely to workes following faith; which may be ſaid to iuſtifie vs before men, becauſe they doe declare vs to be iuſt: and that you may more eaſily perceiue that St. *Auſtin* teaches the ſame, you muſt vnderſtand that hee did conſider a two-fold act in iuſtification; the firſt is *actus eſſentialis*, whereby we are iuſtified in the ſight of God, and ſo S. *Auſtin* ſayes that we are iuſtified by grace onely: *gratis iuſtificatur homo per fidem ſine operibus legis*; Man is iuſtified freely without the workes of the Law. And a little after, *Gratis dicitur, quia iuſtificationem opera non precedunt*; It is ſaid to be freely, becauſe good workes doe not goe before iuſtification. The ſecond is, *actus declarativus*; when a man is iuſtified by faith in the ſight of God, then it breakes forth into good workes, which doe declare him to be iuſtified before men. Of which Saint *Auſtin* makes mention, treating of thoſe words of the Apoſtle (*Factores legis iuſtificabuntur;*) (the doers of the Law ſhal be iuſtified:) *certè ita dictum eſt* (ſaith he) *iuſtificabuntur,) ac ſi diceretur, Juſti habebuntur, iuſti deputabuntur;)* It is ſo ſaid they ſhall be iuſtified, as if it had beene ſaid, They ſhall be accounted, eſteemed, or declared to be iuſt. So then good works which follow faith, doe iuſtifie, that is, they declare him to be iuſt before men. And this is all that Saint *Auſtin* teaches of our iuſtification by good workes. Firſt, that we are eſſentially iuſtified in the ſight of God, by faith in Chriſt: *His conſideratis colligimus, non iuſtificari hominem præcepti3 bonæ vitæ, ſed per fidem Ieſu Chriſti; non lege operum, ſed lege fidei; non factorum meritis, ſed gratia gratuita*, ſaith *Auſtin*; Theſe things being conſidered, we gather, that man is not iuſtified by the precepts of a good life, but by faith in Ieſus Chriſt, not by the:

Lib. de Sp. & lit. cap. 13.

the law of workes, but by the law of faith, not by the merit of deeds, but by free grace. Secondly, that good works doe neceſſarily flow from iuſtifying faith: *opera ex gratia, non ex operibus gratia:* good workes follow iuſtifying grace, and ſo doe iuſtifie vs *declaratiuè*, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes. Which imputed righteouſneſſe doth not onely iuſtifie vs, but alſo makes vs liue in the feare of God. *Epiſt.* 106.

Laſtly, Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that a mans beſt workes cannot iuſtifie him before God: *Totum gratia eius imputatur non meritis noſtris: non pro merito accipies vitam æternam, ſed tantùm pro gratia:* All muſt bee imputed to his grace, not our merit: thou ſhalt not receiue life eternall for any merit, but onely by grace. If workes could iuſtifie vs, there were no need of faith; but Saint *Auſtin* ſayes, that the imputed righteouſneſſe of Chriſt doth onely iuſtifie vs: *Videte duo* (ſaith he, ſpeaking of our iuſtification) *iuſtitia Dei, non noſtra; in ipſo, non in nobis*; Behold two things, Gods iuſtice, not ours; in him, not in vs. Deale not with vs (Lord) as we haue deſerued, (our beſt actions, ſtayned with ſinne, are as a menſtruous cloth in thy ſight) but according to thy louing mercy pardon vs; Euen ſo, Lord Ieſus. Amen. *Enarr. 2. in Pſalm. 31. Tract. 3. in Ioh.* *Serm. 6. de verb. Apoſt.*

Neither is this any part of Dr. *Hardings* ablatiue Diuinity, but the poſitiue Truth taught by Chriſt himſelfe, maintained by the ancient Fathers in the primitiue Church, eſpecially by Saint *Auſtin*, who was a chiefe aduerſary to the enemies of grace, both Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians; that wee are iuſtified before God by faith in Chriſt, without the workes of the law; which is the very ſame that we maintaine at this day: So that yet there is no difference in Religion betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that true iuſtifying faith once had, may be loſt?*

THat hee which once hath receiued a liuely faith, and is thereby truely iuſtified before God, can neuer finally fall away, is the tenent of our *Engliſh* Diuines: and ſo it is the opinion of Saint *Auſtin*: *Horum fides quæ per dilectionem operatur, profectò aut omnino non deficit, aut ſi qui ſunt quorum deficit, reparatur antequam vita iſta finiatur*: Iuſtifying faith either doth neuer faile, or if it doe faile, (as it did in *Dauid* and *Peter*) it ſhall be repaired before death, ſo that it can neuer finally be loſt. Which is the ancient truth agreed vpon (as you ſee) by Saint *Auſtin*, and the Diuines of the Church of *England*. To your obiections I anſwere, That wicked men may make a ſhew of godlines, and appeare to men as though they were iuſt, *donec à iuſtitia cadant*, vntill they fall from their ſeeming iuſtice, which is called *iuſtitia temporaria*, from which all thoſe fall, euen in this life, which haue no other. And of this iuſtice it is that Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes: that ſome liue longer, till they fall from their iuſtice: For thus Saint *Auſtin* interprets himſelfe: *Credendum eſt* (ſaith he) *quoſdam de filijs perditionis non accepto dono perſeuerandi in finem, incipere viuere in fide, quæ per dilectionem operatur, & aliquandiu fideliter ac iuſtè viuere, & poſteà cadere, &c.* We may beleeue that ſome of the ſonnes of perdition, hauing not receiued the gift of perſeuerance, doe begin to liue in the faith which workes by loue, and awhile to liue faithfully and iuſtly, and afterwards fall away. If you conſider his words, you ſhall eaſily perceiue, that he ſpeakes of a temporary faith, which may make the ſonnes of perdition ſeeme iuſt for a time, (*donec à iuſtitia cadant*, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes) and yet beeing vnable to endure to the end, doe fall away from their ſeeming iuſtice: and there-

Lib. de cor. & gra. c. 7.
Lege Chryſ. hom. 1. in epiſt. 1. ad Tim.
Ambroſ. com. in c. 8. epiſt ad Rom.
Tom. 7 lib. de cor. & gra. c. 13.
Prædeſtin. ſanct. c. 14.

therefore he aduiſeth thoſe that ſtand, to take heede leſt they fall. But that true iuſtifying faith once had, can neuer be loſt, Saint *Auſtin* vtterly denyes it. For, treating of thoſe words, [The iuſt man is taken away, *ne malicia mutaret eius intellectum*:] leſt wickedneſſe ſhould change his vnderſtanding. *Dictum eſt enim* (ſaith he) *ſecundùm pericula vitæ huius, non ſecundùm præſcientiam Dei*: It is ſaid ſo, onely in reſpect of the danger of this life, not in reſpect of Gods fore-knowledge, who knowes who are his own, and nothing can plucke them out of his hands. Which perſeuerance of a man truely iuſtified, Saint *Auſtin* confirmes moſt euidently: *Nunc verò Sanctis tale perſeuerantiæ adiutorium datum eſt, vt per hoc donum non niſi perſeuerantes ſint*: Truely now there is ſuch a helpe of perſeuerance giuen to the Saints, that by this gift they cannot chuſe but perſeuer. And a little after; Chriſt hath ſaid, that a iuſt mans fruit ſhall remaine; *& quis audeat dicere, Forſitan non manebit*: who dares ſay, that a iuſt mans faith ſhall faile, when Chriſt hath ſaid, It ſhall not? None, I trow, but a Ieſuite. The gifts of God are without repentance, to thoſe which are called according to his purpoſe: For many are called, *ſecundùm voluntatem ſigni*, which were neuer called, *ſecundùm voluntatem beneplaciti*; and theſe may fall from the faith, becauſe they were neuer truely iuſtified; and yet the propoſition remaine firme and true;

Lib. de cor. & gra. c. 12.

That faith, iuſtifying vs eſſentially and effectually, beeing once had, can neuer be loſt.

That this was Saint *Auſtins* opinion, it will appeare more plainely from theſe concluſions, which he teaches:

First, That no man can bee eſſentially and effectually iuſtified before God, but he that was before predeſtinated to euerlaſting life: *Prædeſtinauit, ſecundùm propoſitum vocauit, & poſtea iuſtificauit*: Hee firſt predeſtinates, cals according to purpoſe, and then iuſtifies.

Aug. ibid.

Secondly, That no man that is predeſtinated, can fall away finally from the faith. *Ita certus eſt numerus electorum, vt nec vnus addatur eis quiſquam, nec minuatur ex eis*: The number of the Elect is ſo certaine, that neither one can be

Lib. præcit. c. 13. in princip.

added

added to them, nor one taken from them; and therefore none of them can finally loſe iuſtifying faith. *Qui cadunt & pereunt, in prædeſtinatorum numero non fuerunt:* Thoſe that fall away finally, were neuer predeſtinated, nor truely iuſtified. From whence it followes neceſsarily (nothing more euidently,) That iuſtifying faith once had, can neuer wholly and finally be loſt; in act it may, in habit it cannot. *Ipſe facit in bono perſeuerare, qui fecit bonos: pro his interpellauit Chriſtus* (ſaith *Auſtin*) *ne deficiat fides eorum, & ſine dubio non deficiet vſque in finem*: Chriſt hath prayed for them, and without doubt they ſhall not fall away finally. This is Saint *Auſtins* Religion, profeſt at this day in the Church of *England*.

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that our good workes can merit before God?*

Artic. 12. THe Church of *England* is ſo farre from holding that our workes can merit at Gods hands, as that ſhee beleeues, that our beſt workes, as they are ours, are not able to endure the ſeuerity of Gods iudgement. And ſo does Saint *Auſtin*: *Nihil præceſſerat in meritis noſtris, niſi vnde damnari deberemus*; If Gods mercy were not our Merit, we could expect nothing but damnation. Now for the Father explaining of this meritorious queſtion, let the Reader vnderſtand, that there are three ſorts of merits, or three wayes of meriting, mentioned by the Schoolemen. Firſt, to merit *de digno*, ſo the Virgin *Mary* merited to be Chriſts Mother, as *Bonauent.* and *Marſil.* are of opinion. Secondly, to merit *de condigno*, which reſpects the reward, and hath a naturall proportion with it. Thirdly, to merit *de congruo*, which hath no naturall proportion to the reward, and yet obtaines it *per neceſſariam concomitantiam*. The firſt of theſe is condemned by

Enar. 2. *in Pſ.* 18.

Diſt. 4. *art.* 2. *q.* 2.

Tom. 1. *in* 3. *part. Aqu. q.* 2. *diſ.* 10. *ſect.* 7.

Suarez,

Suarez; the ſecond by *Durand, Waldenſis, Cuſanus, Scotus*, and others; the laſt by *Greg. Ariminenſ. Waldenſ.* and by *Stapleton*: neither are theſe to be read in any of the ancient Fathers, but were lately inuented, to maintaine mans merit fighting againſt Gods mercy, ſaith *Waldenſis*. But the ſubſtance of all is condemned by Saint *Auſtin*, who dares attribute nothing to merit without mercy: *Unde vocatur gratia? Quia gratis datur: non enim præcedentibus meritis emiſti quod accepiſti*: From whence is it called grace? Becauſe it it is giuen freely: thou haſt not bought that by fore-going merits, which thou haſt receiued, ſaith *Auſtin*. Let a man turne vpon his owne conſcience, *quærat latebras cogitationum, & inueniet, non ſe dignum fuiſſe niſi ſupplicio*; let man conſider his owne deſerts, and he ſhall find himſelfe worthy of nothing but death and puniſhment. *Tom. 9 tract. 31 in Euang. Ioh.*

To your obiections then I anſwer, That this word [*merit*] may be conſidered two wayes; Firſt, to merit by acceptation: and ſo the workes of a iuſt and regenerate man, are ſaid to merit; that is, to pleaſe God, and bee acceptable to him, in the merits of his Sonne. And ſo Saint *Auſtin* ſayes; *Sunt planè merita iuſtorum, quia iuſti ſunt*: They merit by the efficacy of Chriſts death. *Mors Chriſti meritum meũ*; The death of Chriſt is my merit, ſaith *Auſtin*. Which ſhewes, that he meant this merit of acceptation. Secondly, to merit in a mans owne perſon by the proper action; and thus merit is oppoſite to grace, *quia non fundatur in gracia*, ſaith *Suarez*. *Epiſt. 105.* *Va laudibili vitæ hominum, ſi remotâ miſericordiâ, diſcutias eam*: Woe (ſaith *Auſtin*) to the beſt workes of man, if thou, Lord, conſider merit without mercy. There is no roome for grace to enter, where this merit ſtands. *Nolo meritum quod gratiam excludat*; I would not haue that merit which excludes grace, ſaith *Bernard*. It is a ſufficient merit, to know that merits are inſufficient. *Lib. 9. conf. c. 13.* *Serm. 67. in Cant.*

That no man can merit at Gods hands (if to merit be taken in this ſenſe) Saint *Auſtin* giues diuers reaſons.

Firſt, becauſe thoſe good workes which we doe, are not ours, as of and from our ſelues; but they are the gifts of

God: and when God rewards them, *dona ſua coronat, non merita tua*; he crownes his owne gifts, not thy merits, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. And in another place, *Quisquis tibi numerat merita ſua, quid tibi numerat, niſi munera tua?* Whoſoeuer reckons vp vnto thee his owne merits, what elſe doth he reckon, but thy mercies?

Lib. 9. confe. vlt.

Secondly, becauſe none of our good workes, as they are ours, are worthy of a reward: *Nam pro quo merito accipies vitam æternam?* For what merit ſhalt thou receiue euerlaſting life? ſaith *Auſtin*. Not for thy good workes ſimply, but of grace and mercy chiefly. Man, by his owne workes, can merit nothing but damnation, ſaith S. *Auſtin*. *Quæ igitur ſua merita iacturus eſt liberatus* (ſpeaking of a regenerate man) *cui ſi digna ſuis meritis redderentur, non eſſet niſi damnatus?* What are thoſe merits that any regenerate man can brag of? to whom if it ſhould be giuen according to deſert, hee could not chuſe but be damned? Read but this one place, and then tell me, whether Saint *Auſtin* euer taught your dangerous doctrine of Meriting. My hand quakes, to hold the pen to write it; and my heart trembles, to thinke that any ſinfull branch of falling *Adam*, ſhould, *Pelagius*-like, be pleading merit, when hee ſhould be begging mercy. For my owne part, *Bernard*'s meditation ſhall be my reſolution: *Horreo quicquid de meo eſt, &c.* I vtterly diſclaime all my own actions: Lord, accept me, for the merits of thy Sonne; let his death and mercy be my life and merit: and ſaue me, not for my workes, but for thy mercies ſake.

Ep. epiſt. 105.

Tract. 3. in Ioh.

Laſtly, becauſe our workes haue no proportion to life eternall, neither ſhall it be giuen vs for our workes: *Illam dat nobis, non propter merita noſtra, ſed propter miſericordiam ſuam*: *Quid enim boni egimus, vt illud meremur?* He giues vs eternall life, not for our merits, but for his owne mercy: For what good haue we done, that we ſhould merit it, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*? Alas: what good worke can poore man doe, to merit ſuch glory? It is the gift of mercy, and therefore not due to merit. This is the ancient Truth, taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and now maintained by the Church.

Church of *England*. And diuers of your own Schoolemen are of this opinion; who not daring to ſtick to the Church of Rome, doe hold it to be a more Catholike tenent, to leaue merit, and ſeeke mercy. And *Bellarm.* is ſo charitable to his owne ſoule, as to thinke it the beſt way at the houre of death, to deny our ſelues and our owne actions, and to rely onely on Chriſts merits. Which I deſire all ignorant-ſeduced Papiſts to take notice of, that though they muſt not beleeue Saint *Paul* nor Saint *Auſtin*, yet that they would beleeue their owne *Bellarmine*, who thinkes it beſt to leaue merit, and cry for mercy. So did all the Ancients, ſo did Saint *Auſtin*, and ſo does the Church of *England*.

Tho. Walden. tom. de Sacra. c. 7. Arimin. diſt. 17. q. 1. art. 2. Scot. lib. 4. diſt. 49. q. 6. Cameracenſ. diſt. 1. q. 2.

SECT. 5.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that a man may doe more then he is commanded by God?*

THe Doctrine of the Church of *England* concerning this queſtion, is contained in the 14. Article of her Religion: That voluntary workes, beſides, ouer and aboue Gods Commandement, which are called, workes of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancie and pride, &c. Which is alſo confirmed by Saint *Auſtin*. For, preaching vpon thoſe words; That euery man muſt giue an account for himſelfe; he ſayes, *Et vix ſibi quiſque ſufficit*. If hee can hardly anſwer for himſelfe, how ſhould he ſupererogate for others?

It is a pretty tricke (ſure it is done by ſleight of hand) in Mr. *Brereley*, ſo ſtrangely to anatomize mortality, to cut from it all imperfection, and then to turne it into Diuinity. That man, which ere while could not do ſo much as he is commanded; that could performe no good worke as of himſelfe, can now merit for himſelfe, and ſupererogate for others. A ſtrange Metamorphoſis; vnleſſe, (Mr. *Brereley*) you haue ſome ſecret intention, or mentall reſeruation, (which I am ſtill afraid of, you delight ſo much in

Æquiuocation) That a man may ſinne, and write a-gainſt his owne conſcience, as I am perſwaded you haue done in many Sections of your booke; and in thus doing, you haue done more then you were commanded. But that a man may be ſo perfect, that he can be able to doe more good then he ought, *Ego mihi hanc perfectionem non arrogo*, ſaith *Auſtin*: I dare not challenge ſo much perfection to my ſelfe.

In Prolog. ad Retract.

For anſwer then to your obiections, and that the truth may appeare more plainely, it is not inconuenient here to ſet downe what Saint *Auſtin* hath taught about this queſtion. Firſt, he teaches,

That man after the fall, cannot doe ſo much as hee is commanded. *Cum quiſq; legem viribus ſuis putat implere, nihil ei prodeſt iſta præſumptio, imò etiam tantum nocet, vt vehementiori peccandi deſiderio rapiatur:* When any one thinks to fulfill the Law by his owne ſtrength, that preſumption profits him nothing; it ſo much hurts him, that hee is drawne away with a greater deſire of ſinning. It is preſumption to thinke that any can fulfill the Law by their owne ſtrength: which was one condemned hereſie of the *Pelagians. Ex Dei beneficio ipſa lex impletur*, ſaith *Auſtin*. If man then by his owne ſtrength cannot doe ſo much as hee is commanded, how ſhould he doe more then hee is commanded?

Rom. 4. expoſit. quarū. propoſ. ex Epiſt. ad Rom. pag. 1192.

Teſte Auguſt. epiſt. 90. Lib. de. Sp. & lit. c. 19.

Secondly, Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that a regenerate man fulfils the Law by way of acceptation; when God, for Chriſt's ſake, accepts what is not done, as though it were done. *Facta deputatur, quando quicquid non fit, ignoſcitur*, ſaith *Auſtin*: The Law is ſaid to be fulfilled, when what is left vndone is pardoned.

Lib. 1. retract. c. 19.

Thirdly, he teaches, That a man may doe more then he is commanded, in reſpect of the negatiue part of ſome Commandements; and ſo *Auſtin* is to be vnderſtood in thoſe places which you alledge. Thou commandeſt vs, ſaith *Auſtin*, to abſtaine from adultery. Wee performe more, in abſtayning, and louing thee, than thou didſt command vs; (i.) in this Commandement; but not more then

Lib. 1. ad Simp. ſolut. q. 1.

then we ought to doe: and therefore it is no worke of ſupererogation.

Laſtly, Saint *Auſtin* makes a difference betwixt *præceptum* and *concilium*, but excludes neyther *ex debito*: for wee are bound to doe both of neceſsity: the one, abſolutely; the other, reſpectiuely, and conditionally, if wee haue the gift: *Conſilium habet vim obligandi ex neceſſitate reſpectiuâ*; Counſell hath a neceſſary reſpectiue power of binding, ſaith *Hierome*. So that if a man haue the gift, he is bound to performe it; and yet ought not to be puft vp with any vaine conceit of perfection, as though hee had done more than he ought: for when wee haue done what wee can eyther of precept or counſell, we are but vnprofitable ſeruants. Againe, what euer may ſeeme to bee counſell in generall, when it comes to be applied to a particular perſon hauing the gift, it is to him a precept. So that Euangelicall counſels are neceſſary precepts to them to whom they are giuen; who are bound to apply in particular, what was giuen in generall. And this is Saint *Auſtins* meaning, when hee makes a difference betwixt a command and a counſell: the one is abſolutely neceſſary to all; the other, particularly neceſſary to him that hath the gift: and therefore, in his opinion, no man can doe more than he ought; for whoſoeuer hath the gift, to him it is a command. Let euery man ſtriue to doe his beſt, and ſtill thinke that hee can neuer doe enough. So did Saint *Auſtin*, and ſo doth the Church of *England*.

De Sanct. virg. cap. 30.

Lib. 1. cont. Iouinian.

Sect. 6.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that mortall and veniall ſinnes doe differ of their owne natures?*

IT is the generall tenent of our *Engliſh* Diuines, that no ſinne is veniall in it owne nature: and the very ſame is taught by Saint *Auſtin*: *Minuta plura peccata, ſi negligantur, occidunt*; Many little ſinnes, if neglected,

Tract. 12. in Ioh. & expoſit. 1. in Epiſt. Ioh.

doe kill. If little sinnes (which you call veniall) will kill the soule, then they are not veniall in their owne nature: but the former is true in Saint *Austins* opinion, therefore the latter. The least sinne is by it owne nature mortall, vnlesse it be preuented by Repentance. A sinne may consist with grace, and yet not be veniall by nature; as Saint *Austin* testifies: For euery sinne being by nature mortall, may be made veniall by grace.

Lib. de Sp. & lit. cap. 28.

Neyther will the coincidency of the members of your diuision of sinne, into mortall and veniall, hold any correspondency with Truth in naturall Philosophy: for mortall and veniall sins doe agree *in subiecto*, hauing the same formality; *in obiecto*, hauing the same materiality, diuersified onely by intention and remission, which makes no reall distinction. And lastly, they agree *in fine*, hauing the same efficiency (if grace by intercession doe not make a distinction) both being priuatiue causes of some due perfection in a capable subiect: *& mala est diuisio, vbi membra coincidunt*: therefore your diuision of sinne into mortall and veniall, is nought. Which thus I proue: Those things cannot differ really, and in their owne nature, which doe agree in the subiect, in the obiect, in the end, in matter and forme: but mortall and veniall sinnes doe agree so, therefore they cannot differ in their owne nature. This Saint *Austin* saw and knew well enough; which caused him to maintaine a more sollid truth.

First, that euery sinne by it owne nature is mortall: a little sinne neglected (saith he) will kill the soule.

Secondly, that sinne is made veniall onely by mercy: *Peccata sunt parua per Dei misericordiam*; Sinnes are little (not in their owne nature) but by Gods mercy, saith Saint *Austin*, in a Booke which you beleeue to bee his owne. So hee sayes in another place, that euery sinne is veniall: *cui non debetur certa pœna hîc & in futuro seculo*; which deserues not due punishment both here and in the world to come: opposing veniall sinnes to those sinnes which will actually condemne a man. So that Saint *Austin* calls sinnes veniall: not that they are so of their owne nature,

[illegible] de ver. & [illegible] pœn.

[illegible]m. 4. li. q. octo-[illegible] cap. 26.

nature, but becauſe they cannot condemne a regenerate man, being pardoned and waſhed away in the bloud of Chriſt. And this is the orthodox tenent of Saint *Auſtin*, That all ſinnes in their owne nature are mortall, but ſuch as are made veniall by the death of Chriſt.

Now for anſwere to Mr. *Brereley's* Obiections (which indeed are nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe they proue nothing againſt this which hath beene deliuered) and that young Students in Diuinity may not be miſtaken in perūſing the workes of the primitiue Fathers, or miſſe-led in hearing them vrged by the aduerſaries of grace, let the Reader obſerue, that this word *Veniall* is taken by Saint *Auſtin* diuers wayes.

Firſt, ſinne is ſaid to be veniall, *Gratiâ Chriſti*, by the grace of Chriſt: and ſo ſaith *Auſtin*: *Peccata venialia non impediunt iuſtum à vita aterna*; Sinnes thus veniall doe not hinder a man from eternall life. *Lib. de Sp. & lit. cap. 28.*

Secondly, ſinne is ſaid to be veniall, *Cenſurâ Eccleſiæ*, in the cenſure of the Church; of which Saint *Auſtin* ſpeaks, ſaying: *De quotidianis breuibus leuibuſque peccatis, ſine quibus hæc vita non ducitur, quotidiana oratio fidelium ſatisfacit*: Sinnes of weakeneſſe and infirmity (if men ſtriue againſt them, and doe not neglect them) are veniall in the generall cenſure of the faithfull. *Enchir. ad Laurent. cap. 71.*

Thirdly, ſinne is ſaid to be veniall, *propriâ conſequētiâ*, by ſomething following; whereof Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes, that *Quæcunque peccata non faciunt filios Diaboli*: All ſins doe not make vs the Children of the Deuill; becauſe after the commiſsion of them, they are made veniall by repentance following. *Quædam ſunt peccata quæ ſunt mortalia, & in pœnitentia fiunt venalia*; ſaith the Author of that Booke *De vera & falſa pœnitent. cap.* 18. Some ſinnes being mortall, are made veniall by repentance. *Tom. 7. lib. 3. cont. duas Epiſt. Pelagian. cap. 3.*

Fourthly, ſinne is ſaid to be veniall, *humanâ benevolentiâ*, by humane charity; and ſo (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*;) *Pro ſalute quorundam mentimur, peccatum ergo eſt, ſed veniale, quod benevolentia excuſat*; for the good of ſome wee lye; it is a ſinne, but veniall, which fauour excuſes. And ſo *Enchir. ad Laurent. cap. 22.* cited by Mr. *Brereley* but partially.

so, many sinnes are called veniall, not because they are so in their owne nature, but because our loue doth couer and excuse them; and are respectiuely called by vs little sinnes.

The last way (which Master *Brereley* treades) is, that some sinnes should bee veniall by the propriety of their owne nature; which neyther hee nor any Iesuite in the world is able to proue out of Saint *Austin*. That sinne is veniall these foure wayes aboue mentioned, is granted by Saint *Austin* and the Church of *England*. But of that fift way (which Master *Brereley* would haue granted without prouing) that some sinnes should be so veniall in their owne nature, being committed not *contra*, but *praeter legem* (a distinction of *Bellarmines* both against and besides reason) that they should not neede the bloud of Christ to wash them away: *detestanda & abominanda opinio est* (as Saint *Austin* speakes in another kinde) with which Satan and his crafty Iesuites keepe many poore soules out of heauen, perswading them that they need not to repent of such little small sinnes, they being veniall in their owne nature. But let them neuer bring Saint *Austin* to defend them in this soule-destroying heresie: for hee tells vs, that men ought not to esteeme any sinne little: *Quae sint aut leuia, & quae grauia peccata, non humano, sed diuino sunt pensanda iudicio*; which are little and which are great sinnes, are not to bee weighed by humane, but by diuine iudgement. Neyther was this opinion receiued in the Church, till aboue three hundred yeeres after the death of Saint *Austin*.

Enchir. ad Laurent. cap. 78.

Thus briefly you haue the Doctrine of the Church of *England* concerning this question, confirmed by Saint *Austin*, against Master *Brereley's* deluding Assertion: Ioyne them both together, and they will yeeld you this conclusion for the ending of the controuersie: That there are veniall sinnes, *Misericordiâ Christi, Censurâ Ecclesiâ, propriâ consequentiâ & humanâ beneuolentiâ*; By the mercy of Christ, by the censure of the Church, by good consequence, and by humane beneuolence: but none veniall in their owne

owne nature; and therefore there is no reall difference in nature betweene mortall and veniall ſins: nor yet any difference in Religion betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

CHAP. XIIII. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach it lawfull to pray for the dead, as it is now practized in the Church of Rome?*

PRayer for the dead, that they might be eaſed from ſome corporall puniſhment after their departure, is generally condemned by the Church of *England*. Now that the ſame is condemned by Saint *Auſtin*, I ſhall make it euident in this enſuing anſwer. Prayer may be taken two wayes: Firſt, *ſtrictè*, and ſo Saint *Auſtin* defines Prayer to be: *Mentis deuotio, ſine conuerſio ad Deum per pium & humilem affectum*; A turning of the minde to God, by a godly and humble deſire: which is ſtill inſtant with the Lord to procure remiſsion of ſinne, and diminution of puniſhment. Now there is no remiſsion of ſinne after death: *Qualis quoniam quiſque in die iſto moritur, talis in die illo iudicabitur*; As death leaues them, Iudgement will finde them. There is no purging from ſinne after death. If death finde thee vnprepared (ſaith *Auſtin*) the day of Iudgement will finde thee ſo alſo: and therefore hee neuer taught it lawfull to pray for the dead, as prayer is taken in this ſence. Secondly, it may be taken more generally, and ſo (in Saint *Auſtins* opinion) our prayers may be directed to God for the Saints departed three wayes: Firſt, *per modum commemorationis*: or, to vſe his owne words, *ſub generali commemoratione*; which hee calls nothing elſe but a thankeſ-

Lib. de Sp. & anim. cap. 50.

Epiſt. 80.

Lib. de cura pro mort. cap. 4.

giuing for them, and a dead commendation of them, as hee expounds himſelfe in the firſt Chapter of that Booke, *Locum ſuum etiam habet commendatio mortuorum*: to recite their names, and to giue God thankes for them; that ſo their vertuous piety might be made knowne to our poſterity: Which was the firſt end of mentioning the Saints departed in the prayers of the Church, as you may reade in *Tertullian*. And this is practized at this day in the Church of *England*; witneſſe that commendable commemoration and rehearſall of the names of their benefactors in euery Sermon at Saint *Maries* in *Oxford*.

Lib. de Coro. milit. cap. 3.

Secondly, *per modum impetrationis*, as to pray to God that he would eaſe them from ſome puniſhment. Which may be vnderſtood two wayes: Firſt, that he would free them from paine and puniſhment poſitiue, which Maſter *Brereley* would haue granted to be lawfull, but Saint *Auſtin* denyes it, and ſayes, that from this puniſhment the bloud of Chriſt hath made all free that can be free'd. So that wee cannot obtaine for them any freedome from paine poſitiue, that being either free'd already by the death of Chriſt, or neuer to be free'd; and therefore it is vnlawfull to pray for this. Secondly, that hee would free them from paine priuatiue; which the beſt of the Saints departed are ſubiect vnto, in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, as not enioying a perfect viſion of the Deity: and ſo Saint *Auſtin* thought that the prayers of the liuing might helpe the ſoules of the Saints departed (being *in abditis receptaculis*, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes) to a fuller viſion of the Trinity than ordinary: wee may lawfully pray thus: Lord, let thy Saints enioy a full viſion of thy glorious Maieſty; which is nothing elſe but to pray for the ſpeedy comming of Chriſt, as the Spirit does in the Reuelation: Come, Lord Ieſus, come quickly. So wee reade that *Ambroſe* prayed for *Gratian* and *Valentinian*: Lord, giue them a timely reſurrection. And thus (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) it is not to be doubted but that the dead may be helpt by the prayers of the faithfull, to a more perfect viſion, if not continually (that is not to be enioyed till the day of Iudgement) yet

Tom. 1. Lib. 1. de peccat. merit. & remiſſ. cap. 13.

Tom. 10. Serm. 32. de verb. Apoſt. cap. 2. Enchir. cap. 110. De cura pro mort. cap. 18. cyted by Maſter Brereley.

yet at leaſt *per interualla æternitatis.*

Thirdly, *per modum continuationis*, as to pray that the Lord would in mercy continue the forgiueneſſe of thoſe ſinnes, which he hath already forgiuen; and ſo Saint *Auſtin* prayed for his Mother: *Dimitte, Domine, dimitte, &c. & credo iam feceris quod rogo:* I know that thou haſt done it (Lord) before the ſoule left the body, but I deſire thee to continue it, and not to puniſh them in her poſterity. And this is both approued and practized in the Lyturgy of the Church of *England:* Remember not (Lord) our ſinnes, nor the ſinnes of our fore-fathers, &c. Remember them not, to puniſh them in vs, but continue (Lord) the forgiueneſſe of them totally and finally: and to pray for the ſoules of the Saints theſe three wayes, is held lawfull by Saint *Auſtin*, and in a good conſtruction approued by vs. But to pray for the Saints, that their ſoules might be free'd from ſome poſitiue puniſhment, or releaſed out of Purgatory (which is the thing Maſter *Brereley* ſhould haue proued) was neuer taught by Saint *Auſtin*, nor practized by the true Catholique Church. From this then that hath beene ſpoken, may be gathered a direct anſwere both to Maſter *Brereleyes* obiections, and to the queſtion in hand: That whereſoeuer Saint *Auſtin* entreats of prayer for the dead, hee vnderſtands it eyther *per modum commemorationis*, as in the places afore-cyted: or *per modum impetrationis à pœna priuatiua:* or laſtly, *per modum continuationis*, as hee did for his Mother *Monicha*. But as for thoſe which endure any poſitiue puniſhment after this life, hee tells vs, they cannot be helpt by any prayers of the iuſt: *Nullum auxilium miſericordiæ impijs poſſe præberi à iuſtis, etiamſi illud velint præbere:* If men dye in their ſinnes, they can expect no helpe; all ſinnes, and the poſitiue puniſhment due vnto them, are eyther pardoned in this life, or neuer: *In quo ſtatu dies ſum nouiſſimus quemque inuenerit, in hoc eum comprehendet mundi nouiſſimus dies:* In what ſtate ſoeuer death findes any man, in the ſame ſtate ſhall Iudgement finde him. So that in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, whither ſoe-

Lib. 9. Conf. cap. 13.

Tom. 4. lib. 2. quæſt. Euang. cap. 38.

uer a man goes after death, there hee muſt abide, till the laſt day of the world: which is miſerable comfort for the poore ſoules in your feigned Purgatory; when dying, they leaue the greateſt part of their eſtate, for a fee, to your Gold-quaffing Maſſe-mongers, and merry Prieſts, to ſing ſo many Dirges vpon ſome ſolemne Feſtiuall, for their more ſpeedy freedome from the ayery paynes of Purgatory: (when as if there were ſuch a place, of which Saint *Auſtin* doubted, and ſo doe I, but both negatiuely, that there is none) there were no comming forth before the day of Iudgement, in Saint *Auſtins* opinion.

Wherefore (louing Country-men) if you loue not your Soules, yet reſpect your poſterity, in ſparing your purſe; pay not for that which you cannot enioy; eyther you muſt neuer come in Purgatory (as I haue already proued, that there is no poſitiue puniſhment to bee releaſed of after death) or elſe (if you will needes goe thither) you cannot come out till the day of Iudgement. This is the Religion of the Church of *England*, taught and maintayned long agoe by Saint *Auſtin*. So that yet there is little or no difference betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that there is a place of Purgatory after this life?*

THe opinion of the Church of *England* concerning this queſtion, is ſet downe in the 22. Article of her Religion: That the Romiſh doctrine concerning Purgatory, is a fond thing vainly inuented, and repugnant to the Word of God. Now that Saint *Auſtin* is of this opinion, it is very plaine: For, writing of the place of adobe, to which the ſoules of men goe, after they are parted from the bodies, ſayes, that thoſe ſoules muſt needs bee with

Lib. 1. de pec. merit. & remiſ. cap. 28.

with the diuell, which are not with Chriſt: Heauen and hell we know, but *tertium locum penitus ignoramus, imò nec eſſe in Scripturis ſanctis inuenimus*: any third place we know not, neither doe wee finde any in holy Scriptures. Saint *Auſtin* could not find your Purgatory in the Scripture, but was altogether ignorant of it.

Had not Auarice held the pen, this purſe-purging Purgatory had neuer beene writ with ſuch glittering Characters. Poore *Auſtin* (and therefore poore, becauſe hee durſt not teach ſuch dangerous Diuinity) neuer deſired to enrich the body, by coozening both body and ſoule: but plainly reproued the opinion of the *Platoniſts*, who thoght there were certaine purging puniſhments of the ſoule, for ſinne, after death. It is true, that this opinion of Purgatorie is very ancient, being inuented by *Montanus*, 230. yeeres before Saint *Auſtin*. Which cauſed *Tertullian*, (*iurare in verbo magiſtri*) ſo earneſtly to blaze abroad the ſparkes of that new-borne fire, whoſe conſuming flame cannot now be quencht, but with an ouer-flowing ſtreame of boyling gold. And this it was that moued Saint *Auſtin* to doubt ſometimes, whether there were ſuch a fire, or no. And it is moſt certaine, that he neuer taught that for poſitiue Diuinity, of which hee himſelfe doubted; and therefore he neuer taught, nor maintained Purgatory.

Tom. 5. lib. 21. de ciuit. Dei, c. 13.

That he doubted of the fire it ſelfe, (and not only of the quality of the puniſhment in the fire, as *Bellarmine* interprets it) nothing is more euident. *Tale aliquid poſt hanc vitam fieri, incredibile non eſt, & vtrum iſta ſit, quæri poteſt:* That there might be ſome ſuch thing after this life, it is not incredible; and whether there bee or no, it may bee queſtioned. But in other of his Workes he denyes it altogether. For ſpeaking of the places of our abode after death, he ſets downe two onely: *Primum locum fides catholicorum credidit eſſe regnum Cœlorum; ſecundum, Gehennam; tertium penitus ignoramus*: It is the faith of Catholikes, to acknowledge heauen and hell, but no third place. But wee of the Church of *England* doe ſo, therefore we are the true Catholikes, in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement. That this was

Libr. de Purg. 6. Tom. 3. Enchir. ad Lauren. c. 69. Tom. 4. de 8. queſt. dul. q. 1. Lib. 5. Hyp.

the opinion which Saint *Auſtin* held to the laſt, it is very
Ench.c.109. plaine from his vndoubted Workes: *Tempus quod inter hominis mortem & vltimum reſurrectionem interpoſitum eſt, animas abditis receptaculis continet, &c.* From the day of death, till the day of Iudgement, the ſoules of good men are contained in *abditis receptaculis*, ſaith *Auſtin*. Which
Lib.1.de beatit. Sanct.c.5. ſecret receptacles are in heauen, as *Bellarmine* interprets this place of *Auſtin*. And therefore if they muſt come in any Purgatory, it is either before death, or after the laſt Iudgement, and not betwixt death and the reſurrection: for then they muſt of neceſsity be either in heauen or hell: *Nec eſt vllus vlli medius locus*, ſaith *Auſtin*: there is no third place; and therefore, in his iudgement, no Purgatory.

But it ſeemes, you care but a little (Mr. *Brereley*) for Purgatory, when you goe about to proue it ſo weakely:
Lib. 27.de ciu. Dei,c.13. For Saint *Auſtin*, in the firſt place by you cited, diſputes againſt the opinion of thoſe, that thoght the ſoule ſhould endure any puniſhment after death. *Cauſa purgationis* (thoſe are his words) and therefore (ſaith he) *in hac quidem mortali vita, eſſe quaſdam pœnas purgatorias confitemur:*
Lib.20. de ciuit. Dei,c.25. In this mortall life, we acknowledge there are ſome purging puniſhments, &c. And in the other, he ſpeakes of the fire at the day of Iudgement, wherein all muſt be purified, except the Iudge himſelfe. And of this fire it is, that
Lib.2.Genad lit. c.20. Saint *Auſtin* ſo often makes mention; calling it *ignis purgationis*, a purging fire. As for the place of Scripture, vpon which you make the ignorant people beleeue that you
Ench.c.68. build Purgatory, (*Ipſe ſaluatus erit quaſi per ignem*) Saint *Auſtin* interprets it againſt you; vnderſtanding by (fire,) not the infernall fire of Purgatory, but the fire of tribulation. Which interpretation confirmes the former opinion, That there is no Purgatory for paine poſitiue after death.
Serm.66.de temp. *Tempus eſt nunc remiſionis pœnitentibus, ſed tempus erit poſt mortem, vindicationis negligentibus confiteri ſcelera:* Now is the time of remiſsion to thoſe that repent, but there will be a time after death, of puniſhment, to thoſe that neglect repentance heere, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. Purgatory is thruſt out on euery ſide. No Purgatory, ſaith the Church

of

of *England*. No Purgatory, ſaith S. *Auſtin*. From whence we may conclude againſt Mr. *Brereley*, That yet there is no difference in Religion, betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach and proue a locall hell, and materiall fire therein?*

COncerning the place of the damned, whether it bee any corporall-locall place or no, the Church of *England* hath not defined it: neither durſt Saint *Auſtin* abſolutely determine any thing of it. *Homo enim ſum* (ſaith hee) *& quantum conceditur de Scripturis ſanctis, tantum audeo dicere, nihil ex me: Infernum nec ego expertus ſum adhuc, nec vos*: I am a man, and as much as is granted in holy Scriptures, ſo much I dare ſpeake, but nothing as of my ſelfe: Neither I nor you haue yet tryed where hell is. And it were well for vs alſo in this one poynt, if ignorance might be the mother of our beliefe, that ſo we might ſtill beleeue it, but neuer knowe it. But if it bee demanded, when the ſoule goes out of the body, whether it be carried to any locall-corporall place, *Citò quidem reſponderim* (ſaith *Auſtin*) *Ad corporalia loca eam vel non ferri, vel non localiter ferri*: I quickly anſwere, That either it is not carryed to any corporall places, or elſe it is not carried locally. The ſoule is incorporeall, and therefore not capable of any locall motion: it is immateriall, and therefore voyd of circumſcription.

Tom. 8. enarr. in Pſal. 85.

Tom. 3. lib. 12. de Gen. ad lit. c. 32.

Certaine it is, that Saint *Auſtin* enclined rather to this opinion: Firſt, That there was a locall hell vnder the earth: *Inferi appellantur, eò quod infra ſunt*. Which none of our Church denyes. Secondly, That a ſeparated ſoule hath a corporall ſimilitude, not in eſſence, but in action. *Similitudinem apud inferos gerit, non corporalem, ſed corpori ſimilem*: It beares a ſimilitude in hell, not corporall, but like

Lib. ibid. c. 34.

like one: which makes it capable of paſsion from a materiall agent. Thirdly, that hell is only like to a locall-corporall place: *In locis videtur (animâ ſeparatâ) non corporalibus, ſed corporalium ſimilibus.* Therfore, if any man thinke, that an incorporeall ſoule can be *per ſe* in a corporall place, let him make good his opinion. So *Auſtin.*

Lib. ibid. c. 33.

That there is a Hell, nothing is more certaine: and *Bernard* cutting off the ouer-curious queſtions of Schoolemen, determines it: That where God is not by his mercy, there is Hell: but whether there be any one certaine locall and circumſcribed place, wherein the Deuils & the damned ſhall be tormented together after Doomes-day, the Scripture is ſilent: & S. *Auſtin* thinkes it better (*dubitare de his occultis, quã litigare de incertis*; to doubt of theſe hidden things, then to diſpute about vncertainties. Silence both in the Scripture, and in Saint *Auſtin*, not without ſome myſtery in either, hath already ſtiled my pen a blab, for reueiling ſo much, and ſtayes it from any further ſearch: commanding both you and me to ſtudy (*ad euitandum, potiùs quàm ad inueniendum*) (to ſhun it, rather then to finde it:) and to leaue ſeeking of that which neither of vs deſires to find. To this I yeeld. And, ô thou vniuerſall Good, I beſeech thee, free my ſoule from this gulfe of hell, whereeuer it is; waſh it in the blood of thy Son, that ſo it may haue free entrance into thy glorious Paradiſe, when-euer thou ſhalt call it hence, that ſo it may neuer know the place of the damned. *Amen.*

Lib. de Gen. ad lit. c. 5.

Neither ſpeakes Saint *Auſtin* leſſe doubtfully of the fire of hell, whether it be materiall, or ſpirituall onely: (in probability it is both) for hauing ſet downe two opinions of that puniſhment: *Eligat ergo vnum de duobus, quiſq; quod placeat:* Of theſe two opinions, let any one chuſe that one which pleaſes him beſt. And in the Chapter following, If it be corporall (ſaith he) let vs ſee how immateriall Diuels and ſoules can be puniſhed in corporall fire? There can be no puniſhment without paſsion; no paſsion without matter. Therefore no puniſhing act can come from a materiall agent to an immateriall patient; becauſe it

Lib. 21. de ciuit. Dei. c. 9.

it is vncapable of paſsion. This did ſo puzzle Saint *Auſtin*, that he confeſt plainely, *Quomodò intelligenda ſit illa flamma inferni, &c. vix fortaſſe à manſuetè quærentibus, à contenſioſe autem certantibus nunquam inuenitur:* How that fire of hell is to be vnderſtood, can ſcarcely be found out of thoſe that ſeeke it gently, neuer of thoſe that ſeeke it contentiouſly. *Lib. 8. de Gen. ad lit. c. 5.*

Afterwards hee deſcended to ſome probabilities; as firſt, that hell fire was materiall: *Corporeus ignis erit, & cruciabit corpora*: It ſhall be a corporall fire, and torment bodies. Secondly, that betweene death and the day of Iudgement, damned ſoules are puniſhed *corpore ſimilitudinario*, in ſomething like vnto a body. Thirdly, that after the day of Doome, men ſhall be puniſhed *ſolidis corporibus*, in ſolid bodies, and diuels in ayery bodyes. And laſtly, that incorporeall ſpirits may be tormented with a corporall fire; not that it was ſo poſitiuely, but that it might bee ſo, *miro & ineffabili modo*, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes. Theſe tenents are onely coniecturall. *Quid horum vèrum ſit, &c.* The truth of theſe hidden myſteries ſhall be reuealed vnto vs, not by neceſſary experience, (for that were miſerable) but by a perfect intuitiue knowledge; when all the Elect ſhall ſee and know, what and how the damned ſuffer. And this is all that Saint *Auſtin* teaches concerning hell fire; neither is it contradicted by the Church of *England*. As for that tenent of Dr. *Reynolds*, he did but as Saint *Auſtin* taught him, in difficult queſtions, to hold that opinion which ſeemes moſt probable: for ſo did Saint *Auſtin* himſelfe; therefore this breakes not the agreement betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*. *Lib. 21. de ciuit. Dei, c. 10.* *Lib. 12. de Gen. ad lit. c. 33.* *Lib. 4. de trin. c. 13.* *Lib. 20. de ciuit. Dei c. 22.*

Concerning Chriſts deſcending into hell, it is certaine, that by hell, Saint *Auſtin* meant the hell of the damned, and not *Limbus Patrum*, which is neither hell, nor a part of hell, in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement. Now that it was the hell of the damned into which Chriſt deſcended in ſoule, it will appeare plainely by this; becauſe that therein, there were heathen Orators, Poets, and Philoſophers, who were not put in the ſame place with the Fathers: for thoſe

Serm. 137. de temp.

priſoners liued in great ſorrow, ſighing for the torments which the diuels inflicted on them, deſpairing of any good, which the Fathers could not doe. Whereunto may be added, that *Bellarmine* in the firſt edition of his Controuerſies, alledges Saint *Auſtin*, to proue that Chriſt deſcended into the hell of the damned: Which is the tenent of the Church of *England*.

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Saints ought to be inuocated?*

Art. 22.

THe Church of *England* teaches, that inuocation of Saints is a vaine inuention, repugnant to the Word of God. And ſo teaches Saint *Auſtin*, that *homines Dei*, (meaning the Saints departed) *ſuo loco & ordine nominantur, non tamen à Sacerdote qui ſacrificat, inuocantur*: The Saints are named in their place and order, but they are not inuocated by the prieſt that ſacrifices. A commemoration he allows, but no inuocatiõ. And he giues two reaſons why we ſhould not pray vnto Saints. The firſt is, in reſpect of the Saints themſelues: *Ipſi Sancti, vel homines, vel Angeli exhiberi ſibi nolunt, quod vni Deo deberi norunt*: The Saints (ſaith he) would not haue that giuen to them which is due to God. The ſecond is in reſpect of God and our ſelues: *quoniam creaturæ exhiberemus eam ſeruitutem, qui vni tantùm debetur Deo*: in ſo doing, we ſhould wrong our ſelues, and rob GOD of his glory, in giuing that to creatures, which is due onely to the Creatour.

Tom. 5. lib. 22. de ciuit. Dei, c. 10.

Tom. 6. lib. 20. cont. Fauſt. Man. c. 21.

Lib. 1. cont. Max.

Now, that prayer hath God onely for its obiect, Saint *Auſtins* definition of Prayer is ſufficiently demonſtratiue. *Oratio* (ſaith he) *eſt mentis conuerſio ad Deum*: Prayer is a turning of the mind to God. So in another place, defining prayer: *Ea proprie eſt oratio* (ſaith he) *quam faciamus ad votum: venientur autem omnia quæ offerentur Deo*: That is

Lib. de ſp. & anim. c. 50.

Epiſt. 59. ad Paulin.

is properly, prayer, which wee performe according to vow, and thoſe things are vowed, which are offered to God. God and prayer are ſo linckt together in Saint *Auſtins* Workes, that they can admit of no diuiſion, without iniury to the Author. To be prayed vnto, is ſo proper to a Deity, that to giue it to any creature, is truely iudged ſacrilegious impiety; which robs God of his glory, Chriſt of his office, and the Agent himſelfe of ſaluation; if Sacriledge bee not veniall at Rome. This cauſed that learned Schoole-man to conclude, *ſolum Deum ſimpliciter eſſe orandum*; that God onely ought ſimply to be prayed vnto; and that a Saint was *perſona orans, & non cui oratur*; one that prayed himſelfe, and was not to be prayed vnto. To this opinion, you may ioyne S. *Auſtins* practice, who affirmes of himſelfe, that he would not pray to the Angels, (whoſe viſion is compleat) as he teſtifies: *An eundum mihi fuit ad Angelos? quâ prece?* Which is an interrogation negatiue; as if he ſhould haue ſaid, I will not pray to Angels, much leſſe to Saints, who haue not yet compleat happineſſe in the perfect viſion, nor any particular knowledge of vs on earth. *Ibi ſunt ſpiritus defunctorum, vbi non vident, neque audiunt quæ aguntur aut eueniunt hominibus*, ſaith *Auſtin*: The ſpirits of men departed, are there, where they neither ſee nor heare what things are done amongſt men. They doe not know our eſtates, they cannot heare vs; and therefore not to be inuocated. And here (Mr. *Brereley*) you haue the opinion and the practice of Saint *Auſtin* againſt you. If you be aliue, repent of this iniury done to the ſoule of this Saint, in making the world beleeue, hee taught that which hee neuer did; and eſpecially for abuſing the Workes of that learned Father.

Alex. Halenſ. 4. 92. *mem.* 1. *art.* 4.

Lib. 10. *conf.* c. 42.

Lib. de Sp. & Anim. c. 29. & *Lib. de cura pro mort. ge. c.* 13.

For anſwere then to your obiections, (whoſe weakneſs addes great ſtrength to the cauſe in hand) Firſt, you ſay, that Saint *Auſtin* prayed to *Cyprian*. His words are theſe: *Adiunet nos itaq; orationibus ſuis, &c.* Which is only *familiaris Cypriani compellatio*; a wiſh, and no prayer. And ſo I may lawfully ſay, Let Saint *Auſtin* helpe me with his prayers, that I may truely write that Religion which he beleeued.

ued. Neither doe I pray to him in ſaying ſo, but onely wiſh or deſire the accompliſhment of that which God hath determined to be done: with a (*fiat*) let it be done. So Saint *Auſtin*, beleeuing that *Cyprian* was a Saint in heauen, & that he did pray for the generall good of the Saints on earth, ſhewed his deſire (*compellando, non orando*) that *Cyprian* ſhould helpe them with his prayers: and it is granted, that the Saints in heauen doe pray for the general good of Gods Children vpon earth.

In the ſecond which you alledge, Saint *Auſtin* playes the true Hiſtorian: *factum narrat, ſed bene factum non narrat*: he ſhewes that ſuch a thing (which you call a ſtrange miracle) was done, but he ſayes not that it was well done. And the whole controuerſie depends not *de facto*, (for it is euident that the Diuell hath beene inuocated) but onely *de iure facti*; with what right men may doe it. Now Saint *Auſtin* ſayes, men ought not to doe it. And ſo does the Church of *England*. Pray therefore vnto God onely, with a true and liuely faith, in the Name of Ieſus Chriſt, and thou ſhalt be heard in all thy requeſts. This is the ancient Catholike Truth, taught by Saint *Auſtin*, and maintained by the Church of *England*.

Sect. 5.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Saints may bee worſhipped?*

WHat the Church of *England* holds concerning the inuocation of Saints, the ſame ſhee teaches of their adoration. That it is a fond thing vainly inuented, and repugnant to the Word of God. And ſo ſayes Saint *Auſtin*; *Non ſit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum, &c.* Let not that be our Religion, which teaches the worſhipping of dead men. Where S. *Auſtin* dehorts vs from that Religion which teaches the worſhipping of Saints departed, as being a falſe Religion. But the Religi-

Tom. 3. lib. de ver. relig. c. vlt.

Vid. Orig. lib. 8. aduerſ. Celſum.

on

on of the Church of *Rome* teaches worſhipping of Saints departed, and therefore (in Saints *Auſtins* opinion) it is to be forſaken, as a falſe religion.

Athanaſ. orat. 4. cont. Arrianos. Nazianz. orat. in Baſil. magnum. Epipha. lib. 3. hereſ. 79. Ambroſ. lib. 2. de Sp. ſanct. c. 6. Hieron. tom 2. Epiſt. aduerſ. Vigillant.

Wherefore (Maſter *Brereley*) ſeeing you haue taken ſo much paines, as to make St. *Auſtin* the Patron of this Nouelty, who was neuer tainted in the leaſt kinde with this infectious ſpot of Hereſie, let me intreat you, for your own good, to take ſo much more, as to re-call what you haue written; and neuer bluſh, for *Auſtin* himſelfe may haue retractions: which done, you may ioyne with him & the Church of *England* in theſe concluſions:

Firſt, that God onely is to be worſhipped, both with adoration and ſeruice; both λατρεια and δυλεια doe belong to God, ſaith *Auſtin*, *Tom. 4. lib. 2. q. ſup. Exod. queſt. 94.* δυλεια, *debetur Deo tanquàm Domino:* λατρεια, *Deo tanquam Deo:* both belong to God; the one to God as God; the other, to God as Lord. Maſter *Brereley* ſayes that δυλεια is due vnto Saints. Saint *Auſtin* ſayes it is due vnto God, as Lord of all things. Hence thou maiſt iudge (Chriſtian Reader) what a maſſe of errours may daily proceed from ſuch a ſpurious braine, who dares auerre any thing, without the leaſt ſhew of truth; but as this is, ſo are the reſt of his aſſertions, either falſe or impertinent.

Secondly, that Saints are to be honoured, but not adored nor worſhipped: *Honorandi ſunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*: Saints are to be honoured for imitation, not adored for Religion. Nothing can be ſpoken more plaine againſt the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, that no religious worſhip is due vnto them; we honour them with loue, but not with ſeruice. And in another place, Saint *Auſtin* defining which was the Catholique Church, tells vs, That is the Catholique Church, the true Mother of Chriſtians, which teaches the worſhipping of God onely, *Et nullam nobis adorandam creaturam, inducens cui ſeruire iubeamur, &c.* bringing in no creature to be adored of vs. But the Church of *Rome* commands the worſhipping of creatures; therfore in Saint *Auſtins* opinion, the Church of *Rome* is not the true Catholique

Lib. ibid.

Lib. de mor. Eccleſ. cap. 30.

tholique Church; which is the opinion alſo of the Church of *England*.

To conclude then, with anſwere to your obiections: firſt, you alledge that ſaying of Saint *Auſtin* concerning Martyrs: *Honoramus memorias eorum tanquam Sanctorum hominum Dei, &c.* From whence you gather, that Saints are to be worſhipped. Bluſh, battered Logick, creepe into ſome Cell, turne Nun, and vow neuer to haue more dealing with any Ieſuites, who doe ſo groſly abuſe thee: for if Saint *Auſtin* ſay (*honorare*) a Ieſuite will conclude with an (*adorare*) without any reſpect to the premiſes. This is your *nouum Organon*, that new Logicke and Philoſophy, which, to build vp man and mortality, ouerthrowes truth and Diuinity. For no ſuch thing can be concluded from that place in *Auſtin*. Another place you alledge, where Saint *Auſtin* entreats of the reſurrection of the dead; but not a word of any worſhip or honour to Saints. It may be it was a miſtake in your Notary, or in the Printer: the words you meane are theſe: *Colimus ergo Martyres eo cultu dilectionis, quo & in hac vita coluntur ſancti homines Dei, &c.* We worſhip Martyrs with that worſhip of loue (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) wherwith men liuing are worſhipped. Now the Church of *Rome* doth not worſhip liuing Saints with religious worſhip, therefore (in St. *Auſtins* opinion) ſhee ought not to doe it to Saints departed: for it is *eo cultu, quo in hac vita coluntur homines*; which is nothing but ciuill honour, due to men on earth, and Saints in heauen: for this word (worſhip) may be taken two wayes: firſt, *politicè*: and ſo wee are ſaid to worſhip men, ſet in places of worſhip and honour.

Lib. 8. de Ciuit. Dei, cap. vlt.

Ex lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei, c. 21.

Tom. 6. lib. 20. cont. Fauſt. Manic. cap. 21.

Epiphan. lib. 3. hæreſ. 79. Virgo erat Maria & honorata, ſed nõ ad adorationem nobis data.

Secondly, *Theologicè*: and ſo *neque Helias, neque Iohannes, neque quiſquam Sanctus adoratur*; Neyther *Elias* nor *Iohn*, nor any Saint is to be adored, but God onely: *Et dicant mihi adoratores (Adulatores)* ſaith St. *Auſtin*, whether there was any other thing taught, for (at leaſt) 400. yeeres after Chriſt. Seeing then that this is the ancient truth, and that the other is new, and thereforeadulterate, I hope, euery true-hearted Catholique-Chriſtian wil yeeld

to Saint *Auſtins* exhortation: *Religet nos Religio, vni omnipotenti Deo, nullâ interpoſitâ creaturâ*; Let the true Catholique Religion binde vs to worſhip God onely: Let vs honour ſanctity, but aſcribe diuine worſhip only to a Deity. Thus did Saint *Auſtin*, and thus doth the Church of *England*: So that hitherto there is no difference in Religion betweene them. *De vera relig. vlt.*

Sect. 6.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that the Reliques of Saints are to be reuerenced, as they are at this day in the Church of Rome?*

THe Church of *Rome* teaches, that the Reliques of Saints are to be adored & reuerenced. The Church of *England* teaches the contrary: and ſo doth Saint *Auſtin*: *Timeo adorare terram, ne damnet me qui fecit cœlũ & terram.* Now, to adore the fleſh and bones of Saints, what is it elſe, but to adore the earth, duſt and aſhes? which Saint *Auſtin* durſt neuer teach: And therefore whoſoeuer deſires to behold into what a Labirynthian Maze of errours Idolatry, leads her fauourites, let him onely follow Mr. *Brereley*, in reading, but not beleeuing, theſe few Sections of Treaſon: firſt, how he robbes God of that worſhip which is due vnto him as Lord: ſecondly, he giues it to Saints and Angels, who are vnwillingly enriched with that kinde of theeuery: and laſtly, what they refuſe, hee hangs vpon their reliques, things which neuer had that fading priuiledge to be mortall; as not daring to keepe any thing himſelf, which is ſtolne from the Almighty: Neither is this ſufficient iniury to God and himſelfe, but hee accuſes innocent *Auſtin*, as partner with him in this felonious action; who pleads, Not guilty, and vrges for himſelfe an abſolute improbation of it, that hee had often reproued the Monkes of his time for worſhipping and carrying about *Fimbrias et Phylacteria Martyrum*: ſo the author. *Bellarm. lib. 2. de Reliq. Sanct. c. 21.* *In Pſalm. 98.* *Δουλεια debetur Deo tanquam Domino, ſait Saint Auſt. Tom. 4. lib. 2. quæſt. ſup. Exod. q. 94.*

Tom.3 lib.de opere Monach. cap.28.

thor of thoſe queſtions *ex veteri Teſtamento*, giuing a reaſon why *Ioſeph* commanded his aſhes to be carryed out of Ægypt into Canaan, ſayes it was, leſt they ſhould worſhip them as Reliques, and ſo fall to Idolatry; and herein he ſhewed himſelfe to be free from that vaine ſuperſtition of the Ægyptians, who vſed to worſhip the Aſhes of men departed; which is the very ſame that you practiſe at this day, reproued by Saint *Auſtin*, and condemned by the Church of *England*.

Epiſt.103.

To your Obiection I anſwer, that *honorare*, in that place of *Auſtin*, ſignifies nothing but a brotherly affection, which *Auſtin* bore towards Saint *Steuen*: as he interprets himſelfe in the words going before; that he did honour (but not adore nor worſhip) the reliques of *Steuen* with a two-fold honour: firſt, *honore Ciuico*, as being Citizen with him of the celeſtiall Ieruſalem: ſecondly, *honore fraterno*, as being a member of the ſame body whereof Chriſt Ieſus is the head: both which honours might and may tolerably be giuen to thoſe things that are left vs, as tokens of loue, by our departing friends, without ſacriledge to heauen, or dammage to our ſoules; it being onely a ciuill reſpect, and no religious worſhip: neyther ought it to be denyed, but that wee may giue ſome ciuill reſpect to thoſe things which are left vs by the Saints departed; as commemoratiue obiects, to put vs in minde of their piety, and to approue their actions with a congratulating imitation. Neither is this honour or ciuill reſpect neceſſary, but only voluntary, as being inuented & confirmed by men, 300. yeres after Chriſt, when *Marcellus* was Biſhop of Rome: and then it was no matter of faith, but of ciuill and fraternall affection: but ſince, you haue made it a matter of neceſſity to adore them, and haue inuented ſuch a company of ridiculous reliques, as haue made the Chriſtian world aſhamed to thinke that reaſonable men could bee ſo beſotted. In one place, you haue the bleſſed Virgins Petticoat; in another, *Ioſeph's* Breeches; in a third, Saint *Francis* Coole, and *Thomas* of *Canterburie's* ſhooe: In one glaſſe, the Virgins milke; in another, *Ioſeph's* Cuffe, &c. Theſe things

See Dr. Reynolds lib.1.de Eccleſ.Rom. Idolloat.cap.9. Sect.10.

things haue deluded the ignorant Laity, and brought them to an extreme height of ſuperſtitious Idolatry; to buy them, and bow vnto them: which is condemned by Saint *Auſtin*, and the Church of *England*. *Lib. de opere Monach. cap. 28.*

Sect. 7.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that it is lawfull to vſe the Images of Chriſt, and of his Saints, in matters of Religion?*

Tibi roganti (Brereley) reſpondere non debeo, niſi volenti ſcire quod rogas; I ought not to anſwere you (Maſter *Brereley*.) vnleſſe you be willing to know and vnderſtand what you aske. But if your want of knowledge be ſupplyed with a deſire of direction, it will be neceſſary both to moue and decide this queſtion, concerning Pictures and Images; whoſe antiquity is built onely vpon vncertainty; their prime originall beeing queſtioned by all, truely determined by none. Moſt probable it is, that the Ægyptians receiued them from the Babylonians; from whence they were deriued to the Greeke & Latine Churches; who firſt vſed Images onely for a helpe of the corporall memory, in retayning the hiſtoricall relations of the proweſſe of their predeceſſors; into which impure ſpirits did afterwards winde themſelues, ſo that preſently men became adorers of Diuels in thoſe Images, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*: and although Saint *Auſtin* had no occaſion (as you ſay) to entreat at large of Images; becauſe in his time they were not defined to be *libros Laicorum*: dumbe characters to teach the blinde Laity, yet he hath taught enough to ouerthrow all religious vſe of Images: firſt, by his owne practice, who would neuer ſuffer Images in his owne Church. Secondly, by diuers poſitions which hee taught & maintained: firſt, that that Religion is moſt pure, which is without Images: *Caſtiúſque ſine ſimulachris exiſtimat obſeruari religionem*: citing it out of *Varro*, and giues him

Aug. tom. 1. lib. 1. de liber. arb. c. 12.

Lib. 8. de Ciuit. Dei, cap. 24.

Teſte Hier. Zanch. tom. 4. operum, pag. 394. Lib. 4. de Ciuit. Dei, cap. 31.

this approbation for it: Though *Varro* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) attained not to the knowledge of the true God, yet in this ſaying of Images (*Caſtiùs Dij obſeruantur ſine Simulachris*) (the gods are better ſerued without Images) *quantum propinquauerit veritati, quis non videat?* how neere he came to the truth who doth not ſee? Where *Auſtin* approues of *Varro*, for ſaying that GOD might be better worſhipped without than with Images. Secondly, That the ancient Romanes had no Images for 170. yeeres together, *Prudenter exiſtimans Deũ facilè poſſe in Simulachrorũ ſtoliditate contemni*, ſaith *Auſtin*; the fooliſhneſſe of Images may bring GOD into contempt; as it doth in the new Church of *Rome*. Thirdly, that it is altogether vnlawfull to make any picture or image of God, *Tale enim Simulachrum Deo nefas eſt Chriſtiano in Templo collocare, &c.* It is a wickedneſſe to place any image of God, or to God, in any Chriſtian Temple. And Saint *Auſtin* giues the reaſon, Leſt wee ſhould commit ſacriledge, by turning the glory of the incorruptible God, into the image of a corruptible man. And therefore that vſuall practice of yours, in making and allowing images of God the Father, like vnto an old man, with a long gray beard, ſitting in a chayre, and holding the world in his hand, cannot be approued without great impiety; St. *Auſtin* ſayes, Not without ſacriledge: ſo that *Bellarmine* dares not defend it. Fourthly, that it is lawfull to make and vſe images of any viſible thing for any ciuill vſe or reſpect (*extra Religionis vſum*) and that for foure ends: firſt, *vtilitatis gratiâ*, to helpe inuention: ſecondly, *voluptatis causâ*, to helpe affection: thirdly, *honoris gratiâ*, to ſtirre vp imitation: fourthly, *causâ ornatus*, to preſerue reputation. Let not images adulterate Religion, nor pride vſher in theſe ends, and they cannot chuſe but be lawfull; onely let vs obſerue Saint *Auſtins* condition, not to place them in Churches, Chappels, nor other houſes conſecrated to diuine ſeruice; for that is dangerous, ſaith St. *Auſtin*: *Cum his locantur ſedibus, honorabili ſublimitate, vt à precantibus attendantur, &c. veneratione multitudinis, Dei cultus eis impenditur*: when they are placed on ſeats vpon high, that they

Ibid.

Tom. 3. lib. de fide & ſym. cap. 7. Tom. 8. enarr. in Pſal. 113.

Lib. 2. de Imag. cap. 8.

Epiſt. 49. ſolut. 3. queſt.

they may be beheld of thoſe that pray, the worſhip of God is beſtowed on them by the multitude. So in another place: *Quis adorat vel orat, intuens Simulachrum, qui non ſic afficitur vt ab eo ſe exaudiri putet, &c?* Who does worſhip or pray, beholding an Image, that is not ſo affected, that he thinkes himſelfe to be heard of it? And therefore Saint *Auſtin* would neuer conſent that Images ſhould be ſet in Churches. And *Lactantius* ſayes, that whereſoeuer God is worſhipped by Images, there is no Religion at all. *Enarr. in Pſal. 113. Epiſt. 119. cap. 11. Lib. 2. de orig. err. cap. 18.*

To your Obiection I anſwer, That it is but only verbal. You ſay, Saint *Auſtin* teaches the vſe of Images, but you know not where (*dixit & abijt Manicheus*) which ſhews you writ *pro tempore, non pro veritate*; for the time, not for the truth; as *Optatus* once ſpoke of *Parmenianus*. As for that place, which you doe ſo vnaduiſedly alledge, it tels vs (what was manifeſt to al the world before) that your ſcarcity of teſtimonies in this kinde is ſuch, that you haue no places of probability for the defence of your Images: the words are theſe; *Credo, quòd pluribus locis ſimul eos cum illo pictos viderunt, &c.* It was an hereticall opinion in Saint *Auſtins* time, that Chriſt did write a Booke of Magicke, and dedicated it to *Peter*, and *Paul*. Now Saint *Auſtin* giuing the reaſon why thoſe Magicians feigned Chriſt to haue done ſo, ſayes, it was becauſe they had ſeene them painted with him in diuers places: *ergo* S. *Auſtin* teaches it lawfull to vſe images of Chriſt, and of the Saints. A ſtrong conſequence, which would be hiſt out of any Grammar Schoole. Saint *Auſtin* mentions many hereſies which he teaches not: Yet ſuppoſe he held this lawfull, there is a great difference between pictures painted on wals in mens houſes (of which hee there ſpeakes) and images carued of ſtone, & ſet vp on high in Churches, which he condemnes. Againe, Saint *Auſtin* is ſo far from approuing that action of theirs, that he ſharply reproues them for it in the words following, (which place I dedicate to all the louers of Images:) *Sic omninò errare meruerunt, qui Chriſtum & Apoſtolos eius nō in ſanctis codicibus, ſed in pictis parietibus quaſierunt.* Read this one ſentence, and be ſilent for euer; turne *Tom. 4. lib. 1. de conſenſ. Euang. cap. 10.*

Pythagor. nihil ſcripſit, ſaith Auſtin, lib. 1. de conſenſ. Euang. cap. 7.

Pythagorean, and neuer more ſet pen to paper to defend Images out of *Auſtin*: For they deſerue to erre, and to be deceiued, that ſeeke Chriſt in painted wals, & not in Gods holy Booke (St. *Auſtin* would not haue images to be Laymens bookes) but you ſeek Chriſt by pictures and images, therefore you deſerue to be deceiued in St. *Auſtins* iudgement, as indeed you are: for he taught no religious vſe to be made of images; nor the Church of *England*.

Sect. 8.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *hold it lawfull to worſhip the Images of Chriſt and his Saints?*

Artic. 22.

THe Church of *England* condemnes all worſhip that is giuen to Images: and ſo doth Saint *Auſtin*; *Prohibetur coli Dei ſimilitudo, non quia non habet imaginem Deus, ſed quia nulla imago eius coli debet, niſi illa quæ hoc eſt quod ipſe* (i.) *Chriſtus Ieſus*; The ſimilitude of God is forbidden to be worſhipped, not becauſe God hath no ſimilitude, but becauſe no image of his ought to be worſhipped, but that which is the ſame with himſelfe i. Chriſt Ieſus. To adore the image of Ieſus, was a Carpocratian he-

Epiſt. 119. Ian. cap. 17.

Lib. 1. hereſ. 27. reſie; which pernicious opinion (to vſe *Epiphanius* his owne words) was firſt vomited amongſt the Romanes by *Marcellina*; who was *eiuſdem Sectæ ſocia*, copartner with *Carpocras* in the profeſsion of hereſie; and to this S. *Auſtin* conſents; *Marcellina colebat imagines Ieſu & Pauli, &c.* *Marcellina* did worſhip the Images of *Ieſus* and *Paul*. To worſhip the Images of Ieſus and *Paul* was a hereſie in the dayes of the liuing *Auſtin*, and ſhall the dead part now, by you, ſend a contradiction to the liuing? It is not ſo much as probable, that Saint *Auſtin* would teach that, which he himſelfe confeſt to be a hereſie: but your ſtrange doctrine cannot be defended without a ſtrange teſtimony; nor Idolatry, without impudency. Maſter *Brereley* ſayes, that Saint *Auſtin* teaches worſhipping of Images. St. *Auſtin*

Lib. de hereſ. ad Quodvult. d. hereſ. 7.

ſayes,

ſayes, that to worſhip Images, is hereticall. *Et habetur iam Brereley pudorem?* Were you in the hands of a true Satyriſt, he would laſh you for belying the Father. But I would rather haue truth wound your conſcience, then my words your perſon.

Let vs not therefore conſider onely, how this or that priuate man hath interpreted *Auſtin*, but let vs examine his owne Workes, from the beginning to the end, and from them we may gather this vndoubted poſition; That Saint *Auſtin* held it altogether vnlawfull to worſhip Images and pictures. *Noui multos eſſe ſepulchrorum & picturarum adoratores, &c.* I haue known many worſhippers of ſepulchers and pictures, Where handling this concluſion, That men ought not to ſeparate themſelues from the vnity of the Catholike Church, onely for the wickedneſſe of ſome therein, (againſt the Browniſts & Separatiſts of our age) he giues this reaſon of his aſſertion: Becauſe there are ſome profeſſors of Religion, that are wicked and ſuperſtitious: and for example ſets down worſhippers of Images and pictures. Which is ſo plaine againſt you, that *Bellarmine* ſayes, *Auſtin* heere was in an errour, which he maintayned onely in the infancy of his conuerſion. But this is no ſufficient anſwere: for if you looke a little further, (when S. *Auſtin* was in his moſt flouriſhing eſtate) you ſhall find him moſt earneſt againſt worſhiping of Images. Men will be aſhamed to worſhip beaſts, which can both ſee and heare: *& quam pudendum eſt* (ſaith he) *mutum adorare ſimulachrum, vita ſenſuq; carens?* to worſhip a dumbe Image, which can neither ſee, heare, nor feele? How ſhamefull a thing is it? The work-man is better then they, and yet thou wilt bluſh to worſhip him; thou thy ſelfe art far better then they, & yet thou wilt not worſhip the ſelfe. Theſe arguments doth Saint *Auſtin* vſe, to perſwade men from the worſhipping of Images. And whereas you alledge Saint *Auſtin* ſaying, That the honour giuen vnto profitable ſignes appointed by GOD, paſſeth from them to the thing ſignified. I anſwer, that hee ſpeakes there of Sacraments; yet ſuppoſe the I-

Tom. 1. lib. 1. de morib. Eccleſ. cath. c. 34.

Lib. 2. de imag. ſanct. c. 16.

Tom. 8. enarr. in Pſal. 113. con. 2.

Tom. 3. lib. 3. de doct. Chriſt. c. 9.

mages of Christ & of his Saints were profitable signes, you cannot proue, that they were appointed by God to bee worshipped: which is the condition required by Saint *Austin*.

But you say, (and it is a common obiection) that you do not worship the Images, but the persons signified by the Images. To this Saint *Austin* answers, in the words immediately following: *Videntur autem sibi purgatioris esse religionis, qui dicunt, nec simulachrum, nec dæmonium colo, sed per effigiem corporalem, eius rei signum intueor, quam colere debeo.* So some Papist will say, that hee does not worship the Image, but the thing signified by the Image. And this S. *Austin* cals *simulachri interpretatio*, a coloured interpetation, to maintaine a superstitious deuotion. Now, both the Images, and this interpretation of them, are condemned by Saint *Paul*, saying, They haue changed the Truth of God into a lye, and serued the creature more then the Creator, &c. *Priore parte huius sententiæ* (saith *Austin*) *-simulachra damnauit, posteriore autem, interpretationes simulachrorum:* In the first part of this sentence, he condemnes Images; in the second, these interpretations of Images. So that both your Images and the interpretation of them, are condemned by Saint *Austin*. Either procure a reprieue speedily, or suffer willingly an execution to haue cast them downe, euen to the ground. For so they were in a Synod held at *Constantinople*, which was therefore called *Synodus Iconomachia*: and afterwards, by a Councell at *Frankford*, vnder *Charles* the great, by the consent of 300. Bishops: and *Epiphanius* cals it *Conatus diabolicus, & commune scortum*. To worship Images is a diuelish inuention, and dangerously infectious, to be auoided as a common Bawde or Whore. To conclude, Let no poore soule hereafter be deluded with the name of Saint *Austin*, nor bee drawne to worship Images by his feigned authority; for he is as great an aduersary to this Idolatry, as the Church of *England*. So that hitherto there is no difference in Religion, betweene Saint *Austin*, and the Church of England.

Rom. 1. 25.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that it is lawfull to preſcribe dayes of faſting?*

SEt times of ciuill abſtinence from certaine meats, and for ſome ſpeciall cauſe, is both allowed and practiſed by the Church of *England*. Now, that the very ſame, and no more is taught by Saint *Auſtin*, I ſhall (by Gods aſsiſtance) make it very euident to the Reader. And for the better vnderſtanding of him, we muſt conſider, that he makes mention of diuers ſorts of faſting. The firſt, hee cals *ieiunium generale*, to abſtaine from ſin and vnlawfull pleaſures; and this he ſayes is a perfect faſt. The ſecond, *ieiunium Quadrageſimale*, Lent faſt, enioyned for the good of the Common-wealth: *& ſignificatur numero quadrageſimario, quo Moſes & Helias, & ipſe Dominus ieiunauerunt.* Which forty dayes, neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles did determine that wee ſhould faſt, but the Church hath decreed it, and thought good to limit the time when, euen before the Reſurrection. Now, to breake a lawfull conſtitution of the Church, is ſinne; which Saint *Auſtin* condemned in *Aerium*. The third is *ieiunium votiuum*, when a man reſolues with himſelfe to faſt ſo many houres or dayes, to bring his fleſh in ſubiection to the ſpirit; which is left free for the election of time, ſo that it be done in ſome time, as comming from deuotion, not coaction. The laſt he cals *ieiunium imperatum*, a preſcribed faſt, when a lawfull Magiſtrate doth preſcribe and enioyne certaine dayes of faſting, vpon ſpeciall occaſion, and for ſome good ends, either ſimply diuine, or diuinely politique. Neither will any member of the Church of *England* deny the lawfulneſſe

Tom. 9. expoſ. in Euang. Ioh. tract. 17. pag. 149.

Tom. 8. marr. in Pſal. 110.

Tom. 9. her. 53.

Tom. 2. epiſt. 86. pag. 390.

fulnes of this preſcription: for that theſe preſcribed daies of faſting ought not to be kept, was condemned as an *Arrian* hereſie. Theſe things being thus explained, wee may gather the Religion of Saint *Auſtin* and of the Church of *England*, about this queſtion, into theſe concluſions. Firſt, they both teach, that faſting is moſt neceſſary. *Vis orationem tuam volare ad Deum? fac illis duas alas, ieiunium & eleemoſynam:* Wilt thou haue thy prayer fly to God? make it two wings, faſting, and giuing of almes. Secondly, that faſting is not ſufficient to iuſtification: *Ieiunium te caſtigat, non alterum reficit:* It doth chaſtize vs, but not renew vs. *ibid.* Thirdly, that no ſet dayes or times of faſting were ordained by Chriſt or his Apoſtles. *Quibus diebus non oporteat ieiunare, & quibus oporteat, præcepto Domini vel Apoſtolorum non inuenio definitum:* What dayes wee ought not to faſt, and which we ought, I doe not find it defined by any precept of Chriſt or his Apoſtles. That we ſhould faſt, Chriſt did determine; but the time he left as indifferent. Fourthly, That the Church hath authority to determine things of indifferency, and conſequently, to preſcribe dayes of faſting. Fiftly, That men ought to obſerue the lawfull Iniunctions of that Church wherein they liue; *Nec eſt vlla diſciplina in his melior graui prudentiq; Chriſtiano, quàm vt eo modo agat, quo agere viderit Eccleſiam ad quamcunq; fortè deuenerit:* In theſe things there is no better order for a graue and wiſe Chriſtian, then to doe as he ſees the Church doe where he is; onely to auoid ſcandall, and preſerue vnity. This was the practice of *Ambroſe*, and his counſell to *Auſtin*. So that when the Church doth preſcribe any dayes of faſting, wee ought to ſubmit our ſelues to her, either in willingly doing what ſhee commands, or in willingly ſuffering the due puniſhment annexed. Laſtly, That we ought not to condemne any for faſting, or not faſting, at this or that time. (theſe are true members of the true Church, *qui quando manducant, non manducantes non ſpernunt, & quando non manducant, manducantes non iudicant, &c.* who when they eate, doe not deſpiſe them that eate not; and when they eate not, doe not iudge

Enarr. in Pſ. 24.

Epiſt. 86. Caſulan.

Epiſt. 118. c. 5. Ian.

Ibid. c. 2.

Epiſt. 86.

iudge them that eate. But your practice ouerthrowes this poſition of *Auſtin*, who doe hold your appointed faſts to be ſo neceſſary, as that you condemne all thoſe for Nouelists and Heretickes, that doe not obſerue them. When you faſt, you condemne all thoſe that doe not faſt: which is indeed Montaniſme, ſaith *Euſebius*. If the Eaſterne Churches had dealt ſo vncharitably, they might eaſily haue accuſed the Church of *Rome* of hereſie, when ſhee enioyned faſting on the Sabbath day, (which Saint *Auſtin* ſayes is a ſcandall to the Chriſtian Church) and none of the reſt did. *Euſeb. lib. 5. c. 26.*

To thoſe two places which you alledge, to proue an abſolute neceſsity of ſet ordinary faſts, I anſwere, That neither of thoſe Sermons is *Auſtins*. The firſt is falſly impoſed vpon *Ambroſe*, the ſecond is truely fathered vpon Pope *Leo*; neither fit teſtimonies to proue S. *Auſtins* Religion; and therefore I leaue them, as beeing cited to no purpoſe, nor worthy of better anſwer. By this that hath beene ſpoken, it is euident, that Saint *Auſtin* taught nothing about faſting, but what is allowed and practiſed at this day in the Church of *England*.

To conclude, Whereas you ſay it is an opinion of Puritans, to thinke it no hereſie to faſt on the Lords Day, you plainely acknowledge to the world, that *Rome* was the firſt Author of true Puritaniſme: For when ſhee did enioyne faſting on the Sabbath day, ſure, then ſhe thought it no Hereſie, and then, in your iudgement, ſhee was a Puritan; and ſo now (ſhe being pure from all errour) ſhee may truely bee ſtiled *Eccleſia Puritanica*, the Church of true Puritans. And neither *Ambroſe*, *Oſiander*, the *Carthage* Councell, nor the *Centuriſts*, doe contradict this opinion.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach it to bee a true Faſt, when men abſtaine from fleſh onely?*

THe true faſt of Chriſtians, is defined (by a generall conſent of our *Engliſh* Diuines) to bee an abſolute abſtinence from all meates and drinkes whatſoeuer, during the time of their faſting; and not from fleſh onely. Which is contrary to the practice of the Church of *Rome*, wherein, it is a Faſt ſufficiently meritorious, to abſtaine from fleſh and egges onely, during the time of *Lent*, and ſome other times; though they fill themſelues with Wine, hot-waters, Spices, Fruit, or other things of the like kind: which is no true Faſt, as one of your owne Writers complaines. Our Faſts (ſaith hee) doe ſwimme with Wine, and variety of Fiſh: which were vnknowne to the Primitiue Church, and are in themſelues intolerable. Now, that Saint *Auſtin* did ioyne in opinion with the Church of *England*, about this queſtion, it is euident from the place cited by Mr. *Brereley*. *Catholici non ſolùm à carnibus, ſed etiam à quibuſdam terræ fructibus abſtinent*: They did abſtaine not onely from fleſh, but from other fruites of the earth, and from all things that might pamper the fleſh. So *Epiphanius* tels vs, that the Fathers of the Primitiue Church, in their faſts, did abſtaine from all things ſimply, except bread, ſalt, and water. This was the true faſt of the ancient Fathers. But you cannot endure to heare of this auſterity. Neither was this abſtinence in the time of *Lent*, impoſed vpon the people as neceſſary in S. *Auſtins* time, but onely exhorted vnto, as a thing voluntary: For ſo he ſayes in the words following: *Per Quadrageſimam ferè omnes, magis vel minùs, vt quiſq; voluerit ſin potuerit, &c.* They compelled none. Thoſe that were willing and able (ſaith *Auſtin*) did faſt and abſtaine from all meats, and from all nouriſhment, except ſome little, which

Lindan. panop. lib. 3. c. 11.

Epi. lib. 3. hær. 75.

Sozom. lib. 1. c. 12.

which they did not take before the ſun ſet. From whence it is euident, that Saint *Auſtin* reproues the Church of *Rome* now being, in two things about faſting. Firſt, becauſe ſhe teaches that a man may dine, and yet faſt. Which Saint *Auſtin* denyes: *Ita iciuna, vt alio manducante, prandiſſe te gaudeas, &c. quàm multos pauperes ſaginare poteſt intermiſſium hodie prandium noſtrum:* When we faſt, wee ſhould giue our dinners to the poore. Secondly, becauſe ſhe teaches that a man may faſt, though he feede himſelfe with hot drinkes, delicate fruites and ſpices, onely if hee abſtaine from fleſh. For which Saint *Auſtin* reproued the *Manichees.* And your opinion is worſe then theirs; as holding partly with them, that fleſh is vnclean reſpectiuely during that time; partly with the *Nazarites*, that it is a mortall ſinne (dangering ſaluation) to eate fleſh during the time of Lent. And is not this to compell men, and to affright them with the name of damnation, if they doe not obſerue it, contrary to the practice of the ancient Fathers? Partly with the poore *Ebionites*, tying an ignorant ſuperſtition, to a more ignorant deuotion. *Multùm intereſt inter abſtinentes à cibis propter ſuperſtitionem, & inter abſtinentes propter corporis caſtigationem*: There is much difference betweene thoſe that abſtaine from meates for ſuperſtition, and thoſe that abſtaine to tame the body only, ſaith Saint *Auſtin.* The firſt he condemnes, as a doctrine of lying Diuels: The ſecond he commends, as a Doctrine Apoſtolicall. And ſo doth the Church of *England*, if it haue theſe three negatiue limitations. Firſt, *ne fiat propter conſuetudinem*; we muſt not faſt only for cuſtome. Secondly, *ne fiat propter imitationem ſuperiorum*; wee muſt not faſt only becauſe we would imitate our Superiours. Thirdly, *ne fiat propter Dei obſeruationem*; we muſt not faſt onely to obſerue the day or time, as many ignorant people doe; but for the bodies ſubiection, the ſoules humiliation, and for the better preparation of both, more feruently to ſerue the Creatour. This is a true abſtinence, taught by St. *Auſtin*, and the Church of *England.*

Sozom. ibid.

Tom. 8. Enar. in Pſal. 42.

Tom. 1. lib. 2. de morib. Manich. c. 13.

Epiph. lib. 1. hæ. 18.

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *hold it lawfull to vow Chaſtity?*

WEe ſay, that if any man know himſelfe to haue the gift of continency, hee may lawfully vow chaſtity. And S. *Auſtin* ſayes no more. *Quiſq; quod poteſt voueat, modo reddat*: Let euery man vow what he can performe. Now euery man hath not the gift, and therefore euery man ought not to vow at his owne pleaſure. If God be the Obiect of the vow, and power to performe it be in the partie vowing, he may then vow with authority. *Quiſq; quod poteſt, voueat & reddat.* If this condition of Saint *Auſtin* were well conſidered, ſo that none would vow more thē they are able to perform, there wold not be ſo much vowing of chaſtity, and after-forſaking of that vowed fidelity. Yea the whole Chriſtian world beares witneſſe, that many ſilly Gentlewomen, beeing deluded with this ſtate of integrity, are perſwaded to vow they know not what: whoſe itching veines in priuate, do pant foorth many a curſe to their tongues, for vowing vnaduiſedly, what they are neyther able nor willing to ſtand to. When natures neceſsity pleades for the act of Matrimony, authority muſt diſpence, and confeſsion purge thoſe broken abortiue vowes: which is the reaſon you hold, that ſecret fornication breakes not the vowe of chaſtity; as a Gentleman of my acquaintance told me, That hee knew one who held his Land vnder this Tenure, that he ſhould prouide (*pulchram puellam ſemel in menſe, ad purgandos rhanes D. Abbatis*:) a faire maide once a moneth, to purge the reynes of the Lord Abbot. It is pretty vowing of chaſtity, when a man may haue ſuch a ſweet-gentle purge to preſerue it. But 'tis indeed plaine Knauery. Which cauſed Saint *Auſtin* to teach, *Quiſq; quod poteſt, voueat*: Let no man vow more then he is able to performe.

Tom. 8. enarr. in Pſal. 75. pag. 836.

L. R.

Vowes

Vowes (according to Saint *Auſtin*) are of two ſorts: the firſt are common, and thoſe negatiue, as to vow, not to ſteale, not to commit Adultery: the ſecond ſort are proper Vowes, and thoſe affirmatiue; as for example, to vow chaſtity; which is three-fold (ſaith Saint *Auſtin:*) the firſt is *caſtitas coniugalis*, as for a man to vow that he will neuer know woman but his owne wife: the ſecond hee cals, *vidualis*, as for a man to vow, (hauing buried one wife) neuer to marry againe: the third is, *caſtitas virginalis*, ſimply to vow virginity; all which Saint *Auſtin* commends, but the laſt chiefly in them to whom it is giuen. And hee makes mention of three ſorts of men that haue the gift: the firſt he calls *Natiui*, who are endowed with chaſtity by nature; and thoſe ought to vow it, becauſe of the precept; *Qui poteſt capere, capiat.* The ſecond ſort hee calls *factitij*, which are brought to it by art; and a miſerable art it is, (to kill ones ſelfe for feare of dying) to make men the inſtruments of vnchaſtity (as moſt of theſe Eunuchs are) for feare of loſing chaſtity.

Hic rogo non furor eſt, ne moriare mori?

Let them vow what they will, I vow they are vnlawfull members in a Cõmon-wealth. The 3. ſort, he calls *voluntarij*, which, out of loue to heauen, haue alwayes willingly deteſted all wanton and laſciuious deſires, & haue vowed to perſeuer, if God ſhall enable them: *Ex adiutorio Dei perficietur votum*, ſaith Saint *Auſtin.* Theſe things being thus explained, we may containe Saint *Auſtins* Religion about this poynt, in theſe concluſions: firſt, that a vow ought to be made to God onely, not to the Virgin *Mary*, Saints nor Angels: ſecondly, that no man nor woman can vow chaſtity, but they who haue the gift of chaſtity: *Nemo Domino rectè voueret, niſi ab ipſo acciperet, quod voueret:* a man muſt firſt receiue the gift, & then vow; contrary to your religiõ. Thirdly, that if any vow & be not able to keep it, they may marry: *quos pœnitet profeſſionis, & pigit cõfeſſionis, melius nuberent, quã vrerẽtur, &c.* Thoſe that are ſorry of the profeſſion (of vowed chaſtity) and yet are aſhamed to confeſſe it, it is better they marry than burne. Therefore if any man

Tom. 3. Aphoriſ. Aug. 54.

Tom. 6. de ſanct. Virg. cap. 34.

know himselfe to haue the gift of chastity (*quod potest, voueat*) let him vow it; which is all that Saint *Austin* teaches. And thus much is allowed by the Church of *England*. So that hitherto there is no difference in Religion betweene them.

SECT. 4.

Whether doth Saint Austin *hold it lawfull to vow a religious life?*

IN this Section, Master *Brereley* fights with his owne shaddow; in labouring, (from the confessions of *Zepperus, Hospinian,* & *Crispinus*) to proue nothing against the Church of *England*; who hath euer held it lawfull to vow a religious life: which vow is taken in Baptisme, when Infants do vow (by their sureties) to forsake the diuell, to beleeue in God, and religiously to serue him all the dayes of their life. And so Saint *Austin* sayes: *Quid debemus vouere? Credere in illum, sperare ab illo vitam æternã, & benè viuere*; What ought we to vow? To beleeue in God, to hope for eternall life from him, and to liue well; (I would to God there had neuer any other vowes beene made, nor thought on.) He thought it not onely lawfull, but necessary so to vow, and to pay our vowes within the ports of the Daughter of Zion: But the Monasticall life of your Monkes, vowing perpetuall obedience, pouertie, and chastity, and the religious life commended by St. *Austin*, doe differ as Heauen and Hell. And therefore from Saint *Austin* you can gather no argument to maintaine the practice of your lately-hatcht order of Monkes: for if your Monachisme desired no other Votaries, but such as Saint *Austin* mentions (*credere in Deum, & benè viuere*) the Church of *England* would neuer write position against that religious profession: but seeing it doth so much degenerate from that of the primitiue times (as you your selfe are neyther able nor willing to deny) neuer plead Antiquity

Tom. 8. enarr. in Psalm. 75.

At mihi, nil nisi vota supersunt.

tiquity for this part of your religion: let Saint *Auſtin* alone as being your greateſt enemy; who doth highly commend the auſtere life of ſome, who retyring into Monaſteries, gaue themſelues wholly to faſting, prayer, and reading, but ſharpely condemnes the lazie and idle cuſtome of others in his time, and of all your Monkes in this laſt and worſt generation, who turne religious buildings intended for induſtrious piety, into idle Cells of more than monſtrous lazie Monkery: ſo that your Monkes and Monaſteries are in nothing to be compared to thoſe in St. *Auſtins* time, (as I haue already proued in another place.) Neyther doth *Caluin* condemne that ancient order of Monks: for he ſayes they were not ſuperſtitious; but withall he ſayes, that it brought a perillous example into the Church, which was confirmed by his owne experience. And for my own part, I am ſo farre from diſpraiſing the good vſe of the order of that brotherly amity ſo much commended by S. *Auſtin*, as that I cannot chuſe but giue it approbatiõ, where it wants ſuperſtition, idleneſſe, fornication, and Sodomy, (ſins commonly complained of in that order, by all Hiſtorians.) And I would to God there were none of your Monkes, no lazie Fat-backs, no idle ignorant Dunces, who ſpend halfe the day in ſleeping, the reſt in doing and droning out nothing, in the ſeat of the Muſes amongſt my owne Mothers children. But as St. *Auſtin* ſaid of ſome Monkes of his time, which did weare long haire: *Vereor in hoc vitio plura dicere, propter crinitos fratres*: ſo may I truely ſay: *In hoc vitio plura dicere vereor propter quoſdam ignauos fratres*, (whoſe liuing names modeſty bids me bury in ſilence) *quorum præter hoc multa & penè omnia veneramur: Sed quò magis vos in Chriſto diligo, eò vehementiùs admoneo, vt amputetis occaſionem ijs Ieſuitis, qui quærunt occaſionem.* It is St. *Auſtins* exhortation, applyed to this particular occaſion; Let your religious liues be ſo cõtemplatiue, that they may daily ſhew the practize of ſome good works; for idleneſſe is the Nurſe of ſinne, and doth chiefly diſgrace your callings. To conclude, St. *Auſtin* held it lawfull to vow a religious life, and ſo doe we. But as for your idle, lazie, Monaſticall

De opere Monach. cap. 17.

Lib. 4. inſtit. cap. 13. S. 16.

Enarr. in Pſal. 132.

De opere Mon. cap. 31.

Capere vel noli noſtra, vel ede tua.

naſticall life, Saint *Auſtin* doth abſolutely condemne it; and ſo doth the Curch of *England*. So that yet I finde no difference in Religion betweene them.

CHAP. XVI. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach any thing about Antichriſt, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of England?*

Apolog. Reg. pag. 53. & 82.

THe Doctrine of the Church of *England*, concerning Antichriſt, is ſet downe by the pen of our dread Soueraigne, That Antichriſt is an Aduerſary to Chriſt, and is not any one man, but a ſucceſsiue number of men, &c. Now, that Saint *Auſtin* taught the very ſame, will appeare euidently from theſe concluſions. Firſt, hee teaches that there are many Antichriſts. Secondly, that euery Antichriſt is an aduerſary to Chriſt: ſo that hee makes a common diuiſion of all men, into Chriſtians and Antichriſtians: *De voluntate ſua, vnuſquiſque aut Antichriſtus aut in Chriſto eſt: & interrogare debet vnuſquiſque conſcientiam ſuam, an ſit Antichriſtus?* Of his owne will, euery one is eyther Antichriſt, or in Chriſt: euery one ought to aske his owne conſcience, whether he be Antichriſt or no? Which poſition Saint *Auſtin* confirmes from the Etimology of the word (Antichriſt.) Thirdly, he teaches that Antichriſt (I meane that notorious man of ſinne, which is properly called Antichriſt) is no one perſon, but a ſucceſsion of perſons. By this word Antichriſt, men vnderſtand (ſaith he) *non ipſum principem, ſed vniuerſum quodammodo corpus eius* (.i.) *multitudinem hominũ ad eum pertinentẽ, &c.* not the chiefe, but the whole body, (.i.) the multitude of men belonging to him. Yet in this continuate ſucceſsion of men, one ſhal be more eminent than the reſt; which St. *Auſtin* cals the chiefe, or the

Tom. 7. lib. 7. de bapt. cap. 15. Tom. 9. tract. 3. in Epiſt. Joh.

Tom. 5. lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 19.

Tom. 6. lib. 2. cont. aduerſ. Legis, & c. 12.

the greateſt Antichriſt. And this is the very ſame that is taught in the Church of *England*. Fourthly, hee teaches that Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Temple of Chriſt, and pretend himſelfe to be a Chriſtian, and Chriſts friend. *In templo Dei ſeſſurum eſſe Antichriſtum, prædixit Apoſtolus, qui ſub nomine Chriſti, Chriſtianum ſe videri volens, &c.* That Antichriſt muſt ſit in the Temple of God, the Apoſtle foretold; who pretending the name of Chriſt, ſhall be willing to haue himſelfe eſteemed a Chriſtian. Antichriſt is Chriſts pretended ſeruant, and therefore no open aduerſary; he is no Deuill nor Turke: Antichriſt muſt be a Chriſtian; and his doctrine muſt be contrary to the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. And ſo ſayes the Church of *England*, That Antichriſt ſits in the Temple of God, and pretends himſelfe to be (*ſeruus ſeruorum*) the ſeruant of ſeruants of Ieſus Chriſt. If then we be your aduerſaries for this (as you ſtile vs) Saint *Auſtin*, you ſee, is your aduerſary alſo. Fiftly, Saint *Auſtin* teaches, that Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Church, as though he himſelfe were the Church: *Rectius putant Latinè dici, ſicut in Græco eſt, non in Templo Dei, ſed in Templum Dei ſedeat, tanquam ipſe ſit Templum Dei, quod eſt Eccleſia*; They thinke it may be more rightly ſaid in Latine, as it is in the Greeke, that hee ſits not onely in the Temple, but is (as it were) the Temple of God, which is the Church, &c. Which is onely agreeable to the Biſhop of *Rome*, who ſits in the Church of God, as though hee were the Church of God: For the laſt reſolution of your faith is vpon the Church, which is your Pope: whoſe definitiue ſentence from the Chaire, puts an end to all controuerſies. ſo that he ſits in the Church, as thogh he were the Church, being indeed in authority the Church. From whence thus I argue, Whoſoeuer ſits in the Church of God, as though he were the Church of God, is Antichriſt: but the Biſhop of *Rome* does ſo, therefore in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, he is Antichriſt. And this is ſo plainely St. *Auſtins* doctrine, ioyning with the Church of *England* againſt the Church of *Rome*, that I doe not ſee how you can auoid it by any euaſion.

Ibid.

Aug. tract. 6. in Epiſt. Ioh.

Lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 19.

Dic. Eccleſia (i.) Pape.

Now whether Antichriſt ſhould ſpring from the Iewes or from the Gentiles, St. *Auſtin* defines not; as for thoſe two places which you alledge to proue it, they are neither of them *Auſtins* workes. Concerning his Seat, it is granted, that it muſt be in Babylon. Now *Rome* is the Weſtern Babylon, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*; and therefore, in his opinion, *Rome* is the Seat of Antichriſt; which is alſo confeſt by the Rhemiſts: inſomuch that St. *Hierome* cals *Rome*, The curſed City, The ſinke of *Sodom*; and ſayes, that hee was ſometimes a tenant to that Scarlet Whore. Laſtly, concerning the ſhort reigne of Antichriſt, Saint *Auſtin* interprets that place of *Daniel*: *Tempus, tempora, & dimidium temporis*, to be three yeeres and a halfe; where St. *Auſtin* ſpeakes of that Antichriſt, (which hee calls *cæteris maior*) greater than any of the reſt; who ſhall reigne, when the Antichriſtian Kingdome ſhall ſwim in bloud, and towring aloft in the height of pride, ſhall ſway the world with a compleat dominion: for he ſuppoſes, there muſt be a certaine number of men, which muſt all profeſſe the ſame Antichriſtian doctrine; and the laſt of theſe (called by S. *Auſtin maximus Antichriſtus*) who muſt reigne neere the end of the world, and haue *totam perſequendi poteſtatem, qualẽ non accepit ab initio*, (i.) *primus Antichriſtus*; the whole power of perſecuting, ſuch as the firſt Antichriſt had not from the beginning. Hauing drawne to his faction all the ſons of perdition, he ſhal reigne no longer than three yeres and a halfe, in S. *Auſtins* iudgement. Neyther is this contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; for when we ſay, It is but a fable to thinke or beleeue that Antichriſt ſhall reigne but three yeeres and a halfe, we vnderſtand it of the whole ſucceſsion of thoſe men, to whom the title of Antichriſt may be truely giuen, who haue bin in the world theſe many yeeres; and not of the laſt Man that ſhall ſit in the Seat, called by Saint *Auſtin*, The greateſt Antichriſt, who ſhall be conſumed by the angry breath of the Iudge of the world at his laſt comming.

Laſtly, concerning the weapons of Antichriſt, it is granted, that he fights againſt the faithfull ſeruants of Chriſt with

Lib. 18. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 2.

Epiſt. ad Lucinũ. Præfat. ad Paulin.

Lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 23.

Tom. 6. cont. aduerſ. leg. ca. 12.

Tom. 2. Epiſt. 80. ad Heſych. pag. 361.

Tom. 9. Hom. 15. in Apocal.

Incertus autor tract. de Antich. Tom. 9. operum Aug.

with three engines: firſt, *terrore*, with feare to affright them: ſecondly, *muneribus*, with gifts to allure them: thirdly, *miraculis*, with miracles to delude them. And how directly theſe things agree with the indirect dominion of the See of *Rome*, I referre it to your owne impartiall iudgement: for firſt, you threaten all with damnation, that adhere not to your faction. Secondly, you will giue much, and proffer more, to purchaſe one Proſelyte: and for Miracles (whether fantaſticall or reall, which S. *Auſtin* makes the badge or marke of Antichriſt) your owne men are ſo clamorous, that another cannot be heard: nothing beeing more defended by them than Miracles; and yet miracles are one of the chiefeſt engines which Antichriſt doth vſe. And if theſe 3. things fayle in their intended action, pale-faced death muſt enter, and cruelty muſt effect, what policy cannot. How you haue done, and daily doe put theſe things in practice, eyther to affright men with feare, to allure them with gifts, to deceiue them with miracles and lying wonders, or at leaſt, to ſubuert them with fire and Gun-powder, the experience of ſome, the knowledge of others, and all Hiſtories can beſt teſtifie; but I know ere this time (Maſter *Brereley*) your conſcience pricks you; reade this ouer againe; leaue it not, before you conſider what is truth; and then tell me, whether you be not more than halfe afraid (ſeeing Saint *Auſtin* ſayes it) that *Rome* is the place, and the Biſhop there ſeated, the perſon teaching and vpholding Antichriſtianiſme. But you will ſay, that Saint *Auſtin* calls none Antichriſtians, but ſuch as deny Chriſt to be come in the fleſh; which you doe not (you ſay.) To which Obiection S. *Auſtin* anſwers, by mouing the like queſtion: If you aske the Arrians, (ſaith he) the Eunomians, the Macedonians, the Nouatians, the Pelagians, or any other heretikes this queſtion, Whether Chriſt be come in the fleſh, they will anſwere, Yea: *Affirmant linguis, negant factis.* So if any aske you, Whether Chriſt be come in the fleſh, none dares be ſo impudent as to deny it: *voce dicitis, re negatis:* your words are affirmatiue, but your doctrine and profeſsion deny it. Now Antichriſt ſhall deny

Lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 19.

Tract. 6. in Epiſt. Ioh.

Ibid.

ny Chriſt, *non verbis ore prolatis, ſed factis*, ſaith S. *Auſtin*. Thoſe that robbe Chriſt of his titles, of his office, of his honour & dignity, let them beare the world neuer ſo faire in hand to the contrary, yet they are Antichriſtians, & profeſt aduerſaries to Chriſt; who may be knowne and open aduerſaries, and yet pretended ſeruants. And this is the Religion of Saint *Auſtin*; from whence it is euident, that he taught nothing concerning Antichriſt, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

Interrogemus facta, non verba credamus: nam ſi linguas attendas, multas hæreſes auditurus es confitentes Chriſtum in carne veniſſe, ſed conuincit illos veritas: videte, palpate, tangite vaſa fictilia, &c. inquit Auguſtinus. Ibid.

Sect. 2.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *hold, that* Enoch *and* Elias *doe yet liue in their bodies?*

I Will not here ſtand to proue the difficulty of this controuerſie, the variety of opinions about it, nor how needleſſe it is to be called in queſtion; all which doe ſufficiently plead for the Church of *England*, in determining nothing of it: but will onely ſet downe St. *Auſtins* opinion, and ſo leaue it: who holds, that they are not as the Saints, nor as men which are not yet dead; but in a meane betweene both: *Nam aliquid melius habent quàm in hac vita poſſent*; they haue ſomething better than they could haue in this life, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*. Secondly, that they are aliue, and in their own bodies: *In quibus nati ſunt corporibus viuere non dubitamus*; We do not doubt but that they liue in the ſame, with which they were borne. Thirdly, that *Elias* muſt come before the day of Iudgement, to conuert the Iewes. But whether he muſt come perſonally or virtually, *Auſtin* defines not, in the place cited by Mr. *Brereley*. Laſtly, whether they liue in the ayre, in *Abrahams* boſome, or in what other place, St. *Auſtin* dares not determine; but rankes it amongſt thoſe queſtions which belong to the moſt obſcure workes of God: in which a Chriſtian may ſafely be ignorant; and a man may erre in them, without danger of hereſie; prouided that hee teach nothing contrary to the Analogy of faith. For what is become

Tom. 3. lib. 9. de gen. ad lit. c. 6.

Tom. 5. lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei. ca. 29.

come of them, or how they are nouriſhed, Saint *Auſtin* confeſſes he knowes not. And therefore (Mr. *Brereley*) you ought not to condemne any, only becauſe they affirme this, or deny: For in matters of this difficulty, a man may write his opinion probably, without the imputation of hereſie; if he obſerue S. *Auſtins* condition, to beleeue nothing of them, but that which the true Scripture teſtifies. *Lib. 1. de peccat. mer. & remiſſ. c. 3.* *Lib. 26. cont. Fauſt. c. 4.*

Sect. 3.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that at the Day of Iudgement, Chriſt ſhall come with the ſigne of the Croſſe before him?*

THis queſtion is like the former, difficult and vnneceſſary to bee handled. For whether Chriſt ſhall come to Iudgement, with a reall Croſſe borne by the Angels before him, vpon their high ſhoulders, as the Author of that Sermon (cited by Mr. *Brereley*) ſpeakes, or no, it was neuer with full conſent determined by any Church. In ſome ſort it may be receiued as probable, but not as Saint *Auſtins* doctrine, vntill Mr. *Brereley* can bring ſome better authority, to confirme his opinion: For that 130. *Sermone de Cruce & Latrone*, is cenſured by *Eraſmus* and *Lypſius*, to be none of S. *Auſtins*: and therefore this is none of his Religion.

Sect. 4.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *hold vſury to be vnlawfull?*

IN this we all agree. You hold vſurie to be vnlawfull: we teach the ſame. And ſo doth Saint *Auſtin*. *Si plus quàm dediſti expectas recipere, fœnerator es, & in hoc improbandus non laudandus*; If thou expectest to receiue more *Tom. 8. enarr. in Pſal. 36. con. 3.*

then thou gaueſt foorth, thou art an Vſurer, and in this to be blamed, not to bee prayſed. Who furthermore makes mention of a two-fold vſurie. The firſt he cals ſpirituall, to giue a little to the poore, and receiue much at the hand of God. *Sic Deus noſter iubet te eſſe fœneratorem: Da modica, accipe magna; da temporalia, accipe æterna; da terram, accipe Cœlum:* So God commands thee to bee an Vſurer: Giue a little, receiue much; giue temporall things, receiue eternall; giue earth, receiue heauen. This God commands, that we may compaſſe heauen, and be profitable Vſurers. And I would to G O D, that all the cruell and miſerable couetous Clunches in our Chriſtian world, would forſake extorſion, and thus turne Vſurers, gayning moſt, without any ſinfull deſire.

The ſecond he cals corporall, to lend money to any man vnder Bond, to pay more then the principall. And this is condemned by Saint *Auſtin*, as deteſtable, odious, and execrable. *Nolo ſitis fœneratores; & ideò nolo, quia Deus non vult:* I would not haue you to bee Vſurers: and therfore I would not, becauſe God will not, &c. In this kinde of vſurie, money begets money, ſaith *Ariſtotle*: *Parturit auaritia, parit Iniquitas, & obſtetricatur Inhumanitas*: Couetouſneſſe conceiues, Iniquity brings forth, and Inhumanity playes the Midwife. Neither did Saint *Auſtin* vnderſtand this of money onely, but of any other thing. *Si aliquid plus quàm dediſti, accipere expectas, ſiue illud triticum ſit, ſiue vinum, ſiue oleum, ſiue quodlibet aliud:* If thou expecteſt to receiue any thing more then the Principall, whether it be wheate, wine, or oyle, or whatſoeuer elſe it be.

Lib. 1. Polit. c. 7.

And it is as true, that S. *Auſtin* anſwers to that cõmon obiection of Vſurers, who doe ſay they haue no other means to liue vpon: *Sic latro, effractor, leno, maleficus, &c.* So may the Thiefe, the Burgler, the Bawde, the Witch, they may all anſwer, that they haue no other meanes to liue on; *quaſi hoc ipſum in illis non puniendum eſt, &c.* as though (ſaith *Auſtin*) they were not to be puniſhed for this, that they haue choſen ſuch wicked trades to maintaine their liues:

Enar. in Pſ. 128.

liues: feeding themſelues with that, which offends Him that feeds all things. And therefore in another place he tels vs, That theſe Vſurers are no members of the Church: *Intus ſunt, ſed ad eam non pertinent, auari, raptores, fœneratores*; Couetous men, Robbers, Vſurers, are within the Church, but doe not belong to the Church. And confirmes his opinion out of *Cyprian*. Concerning that diſtinction of Vſurie, into voluntary and neceſſary, I neither finde it vſed nor allowed by Saint *Auſtin*. What is lawfull to doe in commutatiue iuſtice, for gratuities, or any other vngilt beneuolence, both in reſpect of the ſubiect and obiect, the lender and receiuer, it is not contained within the limits of this diſcourſe; and therefore I leaue it till ſome fitter occaſion. *Tom. 7. lib. 4. de bapt. cont. Donat. c. 2.*

To conclude, There are two ſorts of vſurie practiſed in this age: both of them condemned by Saint *Auſtin*. The firſt is *vſura nuda*, bare vſurie, to take 10. pound a yeere for the vſe of an hundred. The ſecond is *vſura palliata*, a cloakt, & therfore a more Gentleman-like vſury: which is done two wayes: Firſt, when men ſell their wares dearer, onely *propter expectationem ſolutionis*, becauſe they muſt ſtay for their money till ſuch a day: Which is ſtyled theeuery by *Gregory Nyſſene*. And it is much practiſed amongſt the Merchants of the City of *Oxford*, to the vtter vndoing of many poore families in the Country. Secondly, when a man will not put his money to vſury; no, it is againſt his conſcience; but he will giue 200. pound to another, vnder bond, that hee ſhall pay him forty pound a yeere, for eight yeeres together. And this is no bare vſurie, but a cloake alſo to couer cruelly-biting and conſuming extortion, which eates out a mans eſtate before he perceiue it. If any man think it lawful, let him make good his opinion; *Auſtin* was acquainted with no ſuch ſhifts. And therfore, if any of theſe haue been ſuffered by the permiſsiue Ciuill-Law, it were to be wiſht, that they were corrected by the poſitiue Canō, or Cōmon-Law of God, of nature, and of men, as beeing contrary to all, in S. *Auſtins* iudgement. Whoſe opinion is, That when one lends any thing *Hom. in Eccleſ.*

Verum ad id hoc ego dixi, ne quis in re tali vel temerè ſuccenſeat mihi, quia ſuæ opinioni, humani ore fortaſſe dubitatione, non cedo.

thing by couenant reſtrictiue, to receiue more then the principall, by vertue of the thing lent, and of neceſsity, as being due by Law, it is vnlawfull vſurie. Which is alſo the opinion of the ſoundeſt part of our *Engliſh* Diuines. So that yet I may ſafely conclude, that there is no difference in Religion betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Sect. 7.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that Stewes may lawfully be permitted?*

WHores and Stewes are altogether condemned by the Church of *England*. And ſo they are by S. *Auſtin*: For, ſpeaking of thoſe words in *Deuteronomie*, (There ſhall be no whore amongſt the Daughters of Iſrael.) *Ecce* (ſaith he) *vbi manifeſtè prohibuit fornicari & viros & fœminas*: ſee where he forbids fornication both in men and women. For anſwere then to this ſhameleſſe queſtion, which Mr. *Brereley* hath publiſhed to the world in *Engliſh*, in defence of Whores and Stewes, to the diſgrace of Chriſtianity, & cõmon modeſty; giue me leaue (iudicious Reader) in a few words to trauerſe it, (I hope it will not be tedious vnto thee, & I am ſure it will not be much more coſtly) to ſhew the lewdnes of it, and Ile conclude.

Lib. 54. 37. ſuper Deut.

Multum Roma tamen debet ciuilibus armis (hiſce.) Lucan.

Stewes (Mr. *Brereley*) are permitted (you ſay) in ſome Catholike Countries. Why do you ioyne together Stewes and your Catholike Countrey? I know not, vnleſſe it be to make knowne to the world, that you deſire to make your women true Catholikes. (vniuerſally common) both in action and profeſsion. Neither am I willing to ſtrike diuiſion, or to make debate betweene ſo louing a couple: For now or neuer is verified that cenſure of *Hierome*: *Lupanaria thalamis proferuntur*: Marriage is condemned, but Stewes are allowed. *Meritò qui hoc dicit aduerſus ſanctæ Scripturæ*

Scripturæ manifeſta præconia, concilio nephandæ impietatis armatur, & perſeuerat in itinere tortuoſo, & peſtiferam doctrinam conatur inducere: as S. *Auſtin* ſpeakes in another kind: Whoſoeuer ſayes ſo, fights againſt Scripture, and labours to bring in a moſt peſtiferous doctrine. That there ſhould be a toleration granted for Whores, I thinke the like was neuer read in *Engliſh*. Wherefore now, ye Noble Apprentices of *London*, whoſe aſpiring-ſacred anger could heretofore be curbed with nothing, but the down-fall of whore-houſes, let your malice ceaſe; now let your furie ſtay: let *Shroue-Tueſday* this yeere bee a day of peace; Stewes were hated, abhor'd, and condemned of all, but now they are turned Catholike: defile not your hands therefore in the Roman-Catholike cauſe. Thus Mr. *Brereley* would perſwade you, but he is deceiued: for it is a moſt dangerous Religion, and ſo you ought to eſteeme it, which teaches a lawfull permitting of that which GOD abhorres. *Rome*, indeed, was begunne by luſt, and now ſhe thinkes ſhe does well, in making Stewes Catholike. Lib. de oper. Mon. c. 32.

Reddita Roma ſibi eſt, & ſunt (te iudice, Brereley)
Delicia populi quæ fuerant Domini. i. Romuli.

I wonder any Chriſtian endowed with iudgement, ſhould not bluſh in ſetting pen to paper, to defend Whores. But herein you ſhew your pedegree. It had bin tolerable from ſome Bawde, Pander, or other of that infernall ſociety, but from a profeſt Diuine, it is damnable Diuinity.

Pinxiſti Venerem: colis Artemidore Minervam, Mart. lib. 5.
Et miraris opus diſplicuiſſe tuum? Epig. 42.

Doe you worſhip God, and teach that Stewes may be permitted? But you giue two reaſons of this your infectious doctrine. Firſt, you ſay, you doe but permit Stewes, as the Church of *England* doth Vſurie; which (as you haue heard in the precedent Section) is held altogether vnlawfull. Yet, ſuppoſe Vſurie were permitted, (though it ought not) it would make nothing for the lawfulneſſe of your Stewes: for if the caſe were all one, then ſhould we permit Vſurie, and condemne bargaining, as you doe permit Stewes, and condemne marriage; which wee doe not.

Let the Reader but conſider this, and hee ſhall eaſily perceiue, that Mr. *Brereley* faulters in this compariſon, which he makes his firſt reaſon.

Your ſecond reaſon carries with it a more ſeeming probability. you permit Stewes, only to auoid a greater inconuenience. you permit Stewes, to auoide luſt; and, I promiſe you, it is a very likely way: the reaſon ſounds well, comming from a leſuite.

Dignum thebano aenigmate monſtrum.

Materia, crede mihi, tuis aptiſſima chartis.

But if another ſhould haue giuen it, men would haue iudged him to haue beene out of his wits. Yet, if that wicked medium could bring foorth ſuch a good end, (as it is impoſsible) Saint *Paul* hath taught you another kind of Doctrine: That wee ought not to doe euill, that good might come thereby. Thus you ſee, your reaſons are without reaſon; and the ſumme of this doctrine is nothing but a contradiction to Religion, neuer taught by Saint *Auſtin*, nor by the Church of *England*. But I beleeue your actions, Mr. *Brereley*, are better then theſe aſſertions: *Laſciua eſt tibi pagina, vita proba eſt*: charity bids me iudge ſo, and leaue you. I haue done.

Lib. 2. de ord. c. 4. To that place which you vrge out of *Auſtin*, I anſwer, That they are the words of *Trigetius*, as any one may perceiue, that reads the beginning of that 4. Chapter. And whether Saint *Auſtin* did conſent to them in that conference betweene *Licentius*, *Trigetius*, and himſelfe, or no, it is vncertaine: yet if he did, it is certaine that he wrote that Booke (*De Ordine*) before he was baptized, & therfore before his admiſsion into the Miniſtery. From whence it is euident, that it is no fit place to proue his Religion by: For he euer was a conſtant aduerſary to Whores & Stews, and ſo is the Church of *England*. Our intended concluſion then ſtands firme, That there is no difference in Religion, betweene the Flower of the Fathers, Saint *Auſtin*, and the Church of *England*.

Lib. 1. Retract. c. 1.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach the lawfull vſe of Ceremonies in Chriſtian Religion.*

BY this time, I hope, I haue made it plaine vnto thee, (iudicious Reader, whoſoeuer thou art) that it is both a falſe and a ſlanderous poſition of our aduerſaries, when they ſay, That the Religion profeſt now in the Church of *England*, was neuer taught before the dayes of *Luther*. Heere in this glaſſe which I haue ſent thee, thou mayſt looke a little way beyond *Luther*, a thouſand yeeres and more, and ſee the ſame Doctrine which we now teach, taught by the mouth of all the Fathers: Saint *Auſtin*, againſt Mr. *Iohn Brereley*, who hath lately ſlandered Saint *Auſtin* with the imputation of a new Religion, by picking out a few ſentences heere and there, which ſeem'd to make for him: all which are peruſed and anſwered in this Treatiſe, entituled, [*S. Auſtins Summes*, or, *The Summe of his Religion, which hee maintained to the laſt houre.*] Wherein is plainely proued, That in the chiefe points of Religion, there is no difference betweene Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Which beeing granted, this Chapter of Ceremonies might well haue beene left out, as not beeing any matter of controuerſie: for Ceremonies are no eſſentiall part of Religion; being neither vniuerſall alike in all Churches, nor perpetuall, but may bee changed and altered by any Church, as ſhee ſhall ſee occaſion. For anſwer then to this queſtion, take theſe concluſions:

Firſt, Saint *Auſtin* teaches, the vſe of Ceremonies in a Chriſtian Church to be lawfull. *Totum hoc genus rerum, liberas habet obſeruationes.* So that one Church may vſe ſuch Ceremonies as no other Church vſes, and yet for all them be a true Church. Secondly, he teaches, that the Church *Epiſt.* 118.

vnder the Goſpell, ought not to burden her members with a multitude of ceremonies. Which cauſed Saint *Auſtin* to complaine of the ſtate of the Church in his time, ſaying, that it was ouer-preſt with ſeruile burthens: and that the condition of the Iewes was more tolerable, than the condition of that Church which is ouer-loaden with a multitude of Ceremonies. Thirdly, That the Church hath authority to ordaine Ceremonies: onely, ſhe ought to obſerue theſe two conditions, in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement. Firſt, ſhee ought not to ordaine ouer-many, leſt ſhe ſuppreſſe the Chriſtian liberty with the ſeruill waight of Ceremonies, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeakes. Secondly, ſhe ought to ordaine no Ceremonies againſt faith nor manners. *In his ſaluberrima regula retinenda eſt*: This is the moſt wholſome rule for Chriſtians, that whatſoeuer the Church enioynes, (if it be neither againſt faith nor manners) ought to be held as indifferent, and to be obſerued. And to theſe poſitions the Church of *England* conſents, *Art.* 20.

Aug. Epiſt. 119. *c.* 19.

Ibid. c. 18.

Epiſt. 118. *c.* 2.

Fourthly, S. *Auſtin* teaches, that euery Church ought to obſerue her owne Ceremonies. *Ad quam fortè Eccleſiam veneris, eius morem ſerua, ſi cuiquam non vis eſſe ſcandalo, nec quenquam tibi*: To what Church ſoeuer thou commeſt, obſerue the cuſtome thereof, if thou wouldeſt not bee a ſcandall to any, nor haue any to be a ſcandall to thee. And a little before, In matters of ceremony, (ſaith he) there is no better rule for a graue and wiſe Chriſtian, then to doe as the Church does, in which hee is. So that in Saint *Auſtins* iudgement, we ought not to obſerue your Ceremonies, nor you ours, but each Church is to retaine her owne Ceremonies. And this is the doctrine and practice of the Church of *England*. From whence it is euident, that Mr. *Brereley* hath proued nothing out of Saint *Auſtin*, againſt the Church of *England*, neither in points of doctrine nor Ceremonie. And then iudge (impartiall Reader) whether it be not impudency in any, to ſay that Saint *Auſtin* was a Papiſt; who neither defends their poſitions, about the ſubſtance, nor about the Ceremonies of Religion. He ſayes that Ceremonies are lawfull, and ſo doe wee: But hee

Ibid.

leaues

leaues them to be diſpoſed of by the Church in each particular Countrey, and ſo doe we: So that yet there is no difference, no not in the rules about ceremonies, betweene St. *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

CHAP. XVIII. §. 1.

Whether doth Saint Auſtin *teach, that miracles are now neceſſary for the confirmation of the Catholique faith?*

MAſter *Brereley* perceiuing that hee could proue nothing out of *Auſtin* againſt the Church of *England*, neyther in matters of Religion, nor ceremony, he flyes laſtly to miracles, the chiefe ſtaffe of his decaying hopes: and yet in theſe laſt times the vndoubted markes of Antichriſt; neyther doth Maſter *Brereley* here finde what hee ſought, for Saint *Auſtin* and the Church of *England* doe not differ in the doctrine of miracles, as it will euidently appeare. For firſt we ſay, that the Chriſtian faith hath bin ſufficiently confirmed by miracles; and therefore now miracles are not to be required nor expected, for any further confirmation of it; and ſo ſayes S. *Auſtin*: *Poſſum dicere neceſſaria fuiſſe priuſquam crederet mundus, ad hoc vt crederet mundus: quiſquis adhuc prodigia, vt credat inquirit, magnum eſt ipſe prodigium, qui mundo credente non credit*: Miracles were neceſſary before the world beleeued, that it might beleeue; but whoſoeuer requires a miracle now for the confirmation of it, hee himſelfe is a miracle. *Auſtin*, you ſee, in his time did not hold miracles neceſſary for confirmation of the faith; nor the Church of *England* at this day: for ſhe teaches the old ancient faith, which was confirmed by the miracles of our bleſſed Sauiour and his Apoſtles; and needes no further confirmation: but the Church of *Rome* teaching a new doctrine differing from the ancient truth

Sut. examina. of Kellisons Surney, pag. 8. Keckerm. lib. 3. pag. 466. Willet contro. queſt. 4. Err. 38.

Lib. 22. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 8.

(as I haue euidently proued out of Saint *Auſtin*) had need to confirme it with new miracles, or elſe the common people would not receiue it. Thus you perceiue, that your religion cannot be defended by ordinary meanes (i.) by the written Word of God: (as one of your owne Church did in effect acknowledge to a learned Doctor of our Land.) And therefore you labour to defend it by extraordinary meanes: a new and extraordinary doctrine cannot be confirmed but by new and extraordinary miracles: for which S. *Auſtin* did ſharpely reprehend thoſe miracle-mungering Donatiſts, who did brag and boaſt of miracles as much as you doe. The Lord himſelfe (ſaith hee) did fore-tell vs of ſuch miracle-workers; that there ſhould come falſe prophets, which with diuers wonders, and lying miracles, ſhould deceiue many. So that Saint *Auſtin* makes miracles the badge of Antichriſt: Doe you then maintain your miracles, vphold your Antichriſt. Saint *Auſtin* ſayes, that miracles are not now neceſſary to confirme the faith: And ſo ſayes the Church of *England*, that miracles may be done, but they are not neceſſary to be done; becauſe the ancient truth was confirmed long agoe, and needs no more confirmation. From whence it is euident, that Maſter *Brereley* hath taken a great deale of paines in ſixe Sections together to no purpoſe; all which may be anſwered in a word, That thoſe miracles mentioned by Saint *Auſtin*, might be done, and now may be done, *ad conſolationem fidelium*, for the comfort of the faithfull; but were not done, neyther are they now neceſſary to be done, *ad confirmationem fidei*, for confirmation of the Chriſtian faith; which is the queſtion in hand, denyed by Saint *Auſtin*, and the Church of *England*. Take this then for a plaine proued concluſion, that there is no difference in Religion betweene S. *Auſtin* and the Church of *England*.

Fiſher to Dr. *Featly*.

Lib. 20. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 19.

Cap. 18. pag. 213, 214, &c.

FINIS.

The concluſion of the whole *Booke*, to the Chriſtian-Catholique Reader.

COurteous and iudicious Reader, if thou haſt read ouer all impartially, I giue thee leaue freely to iudge of all; and for thy further direction know, that theſe poynts of Doctrine heere diſcuſt and concluded, are the very ſame which were taught by Saint *Auſtin*, in which he liued and dyed: for my owne part, I haue but held St. *Auſtins* Pen, while he writ ouer againe his owne Religion; I haue taught nothing, but ſhewed what he taught, by peruſing his owne vndoubted Workes, and gathering the ſumme of his Religion into poſitiue concluſions: three of which were ſuppreſt by authority, ſo that they could not endure any other Preſſe; the reſt, (after a long delay, hauing bin hid from the eyes of the World, by the multitude of Prieſts and Ieſuites) I willingly commit to thy charitable conſideration; let neyther my age, nor imperfections (which are many, but haue bin more) hinder thee from beleeuing the truth, which is from the Spirit of God, by whomſoeuer deliuered. And to my Country-men (with whoſe diſeaſe I was once infected, to beleeue euery thing, without examining any) doe I eſpecially dedicate and commend this old, ancient, Catholike Religion, taught long agoe in the dayes of our fore-fathers; *Lancaſtrenſ.*

Fathers; which, I know, they will reuerently receiue and beleeue, because it is the old Religion, taught by so worthy, so learned, and holy Father as St. *Austin* was: I acknowledge, it was the reuerence I bore to Antiquity, when I saw it partly contemned, & partly abused, that first draue me to this painefull and laborious taske, in freeing of this holy Saint from a false imputation, and clearing Antiquity from the grosse aspersion of superstition: which I desire might be taken well of all, because intended for the good of all; if any murmure, it is more than I desire: sound iudgement is rare, and that I feare; censures are common, and I weigh them not; yet if thou wilt needes be doing, before thou censurest Me or the Worke, let me aduise thee (*my meere Reader*) of one thing; it may be thou hast not said thy prayers to day, therefore ioyne with mee, as I doe for thee, to pray vnto the Lord, that he would be pleased in mercy to giue vnto vs both a sound and sauing vnderstanding in all things. Farewell.

Dat. Kynb. 7dib. Octob.
Anno Dom. 1624.

Thine, if thou beest a louer of the ancient Truth,

WILLIAM CROMPTON.